

# Spiritualism Unveiled,

AND SHOWN TO BE

## THE WORK OF DEMONS:

AN EXAMINATION OF

Its Origin, Morals, Doctrines, and Politics.

BY

MILES GRANT,

EDITOR OF THE "WORLD'S CRISIS,"

AND AUTHOR OF

"What is Man?" "The Soul — What is it?" "The Spirit — What is it?" "The Rich Man and Lazarus," etc.

---

"Now the Spirit speaketh *expressly*, that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to *seducing spirits*, and doctrines of *devils*; speaking lies in hypocrisy." — 1 TIM. iv.: 1, 2.

---

FOR SALE AT

THE "CRISIS" OFFICE, 167 HANOVER STREET,  
BOSTON.

HERITAGE ROOM

James White Library

ANDREWS UNIVERSITY

rien Spri MI 49104

## INTRODUCTION.

THE rapid growth of Spiritualism has caused many to wonder, who do not “discern the signs of the times.” But they wonder still more at its strange phenomena. In the following pages we purpose to give a candid and plain exposition of the whole system; showing that *human* spirits have nothing to do with the manifestations.

“Try the Spirits whether they are of God.” — 1 John iv: 1.

M. GRANT.

Boston, March 1, 1866.

Vault

BF

1042

-G73

HER.

457118

48267687



# SPIRITUALISM

## THE

## WORK OF DEMONS.

---

The subject of Spiritualism is one of deep interest to the people of this generation. From a small beginning among the Fox girls some seventeen years since, it has spread till it has become world-wide in its influence, numbering among its ardent supporters many of the first men and women of both continents. Ministers, Doctors, Lawyers, Judges, Congressmen, Governors, Presidents, Queens, Kings, and Emperors, of all religions, are bowing to its influence, and showing their sympathy with its teachings. No other system of religion ever made so great progress in so short a time, or ever had a better prospect of bringing the whole world into its embrace. Its doors are open for Catholics and Protestants, Infidels and Atheists, the lewd and the virtuous, Mohammedans, Jews, and Pagans,—all are invited, all are welcome to this “broad church.”

Scores of ministers have left their churches to preach this “new gospel of Spiritualism,” as it is termed. Large numbers of church members have broken off their former religious associations to mingle with those

who teach the "new religion"; and *very rarely* do they ever return to the Christian Church again.

The question comes before us with much force, What is this "new religion"? whence its origin? what is its object? its tendency and final results? what are its doctrines, morals and precepts? who are they that are performing miracles in all parts of the world, and endeavoring to cause all to adopt this "new religion"? are they good or bad spirits? men or demons? where did they come from? where do they live? how do they perform their wonderful manifestations? Or, is it all mere trickery, humbuggery,—the work of cunning men and women in the flesh? Or can the varied phenomena of Spiritualism be accounted for upon philosophical principles? These and other questions come before us when we would talk about Spiritualism; all of which we purpose to answer, the best we can, in this and the following chapters. Please read them all carefully, before you adopt the "new religion."

We purpose to consider the subject of Spiritualism under four heads:

1. *The CAUSE of the various phenomena of Spiritualism.*

2. *Its Morals.*

3. *Its Doctrines.*

4. *Its Politics.*

1. *The CAUSE of the various phenomena of Spiritualism.*

Every effect must have a cause adequate to produce that effect; and when we arrive at the *true cause* of the Spiritual manifestations, it will account for all their



phenomena. Various causes have been suggested by different writers and speakers, which have explained some of the phenomena, while they have failed to account for others still more wonderful.

Some have assumed that all the manifestations of Spiritualism were the result of *trickery*, practised by the mediums and those associated with them. This assumption might have answered very well in the early history of Spiritualism; but he who makes such a statement now, would only show that he knew but little about the facts in the case. We think no one, after a little reflection, would venture to say of the many thousands, and even millions of Spiritualists, among whom are a large number of men and women noted for intelligence, honesty and veracity, that they are only playing tricks on each other; while at the same time they most boldly affirm that they are perfectly sincere in their belief that the manifestations come from the spirits of their friends. Can any one tell what object all these fathers, mothers, brothers, sisters, children, dear friends, and loved companions, can have in pretending that they have communications from spirits, when they know at the same time that they are only deceiving each other by means of trickery? We think such a position is but little less than an absurdity, and must be given up by those who would treat the subject with candor.

2. Others have assumed that all the phenomena of Spiritualism can be accounted for upon *philosophical* principles. This statement, also, might have been satisfactory till facts were multiplied that completely



upset such a position, and scattered it to the four winds. Yet, it is true, we think, that the manifestations are governed by certain laws, which regulate, or control, the mental and physical phenomena in Spiritualism, as in Mesmerism; and these laws may be understood and observed, and will assist us very much in obtaining a clear view of the subject under examination.

But what laws of philosophy, either mental or physical, will account for facts like the following:—

In September, 1850, when Mr. Charles Partridge, of New York City, was in Rochester, N. Y., he was persuaded to attend a Spiritualist circle. At that time he did not believe in Spiritualism, but went to the circle to please a friend. In the report of the interview, Mr. Partridge says:—

“The mediums, the Misses Fox, did not know me, neither did they know that I ever had a brother, or know his age, time of death, etc.; but through the raps, and the use of the alphabet, his whole history was minutely given me. The day of the month, the day of the week, the hour of the day of his death, were given me; his business and property were disclosed, and every test I was capable of putting was correctly answered. My ability to test him became exhausted, and yet I told him I did not believe he was communicating, but that, by some means, my own knowledge of these facts was reproduced through the raps. He then said, I will communicate to you a matter of business, of which you can have no knowledge, but which will be confirmed to you by next mail. He then said, ‘Messrs. Finley, Johnson & Co., of San Francisco, who had your goods for sale, have failed, and will probably not pay one cent on the dollar they owe!’ I answered, ‘It can not be true; the house is

reputed to be very wealthy; and instead of this last communication confirming the claim that the spirit of my brother is present, it makes me, if possible, still more skeptical, because I feel sure this last communication is not true.' The spirit added further, that he did not think that I should even get an account of the sale of the goods.

The next mail brought letters confirming the failure. I subsequently wrote to the parties several times, requesting account sales, which they did not send. I then sent my account to a house there, to intercede for me to get account sales. They tried to obtain such account, and finally wrote me they could not, and advised me to trouble myself no further about the matter; for if I succeeded in getting account sales the house would not pay one cent on a dollar. And these things I never had the means of knowing were disclosed to me, and things I did not believe at the time have been confirmed."

Many similar cases might be given, if it were necessary, which are most fully attested by reliable witnesses. Now, we ask, what philosophy will meet such cases? Some have said the medium reads the inquirer's mind. How could the medium read what was not there? Mr. Partridge did not believe Messrs. Finley, Johnson & Co. had failed, when thus informed by the spirit; consequently knew nothing about the matter before; but when "the next mail" came from California, it confirmed what he received sometime earlier through the medium in Rochester, N. Y. The question arises, how did the medium obtain the information before the arrival of the mail? When we find the true cause of Spiritual manifestations, we shall be able to explain all such phenomena, which are continually multiplying around us.



While we admit the physical and intellectual phenomena of Spiritualism, we do not believe that *human* spirits have any thing to do with the manifestations. We cannot stop to argue at length this negative point, but will barely quote a few passages of Scripture as a foundation for the assertion. The Bible teaches us that when a man is in a state of physical death, “His sons come to honor, and *he knoweth it not*; and they are brought low, but *he perceiveth it not* of them.”—Job 14: 21. This cannot be true, unless the teaching of the spirits is false; because they declare the opposite. Again, Job says:—“When a few years are come, then I shall go the way whence *I shall not return*.”—Job 16: 22. But the Bible makes this point still stronger and plainer. When describing the state of man in death, the wise man says, it is one where “there is *no work, nor device, NOR KNOWLEDGE, NOR WISDOM*,” consequently it is a state where they know not any thing. This is in harmony with the teaching of the Psalmist. He says, “In death there is *NO REMEMBRANCE* of thee.”—Ps. 6: 5. Again he says of man:—“His breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth, *in that very day HIS THOUGHTS PERISH*.”—Ps. 146: 4. We do not see how language can be plainer, or more in harmony with common sense, and sound philosophy. Again we read: “The living know that they shall die, but the dead *KNOW NOT ANY THING*.”—Eccl. 9: 5. When we find the whole Bible harmonious on this point, we are led at once to the conclusion that, as men are wholly unconscious between death and the resurrection, they do not make any



communications to their living friends before they are raised from the dead; consequently the spiritual manifestations, now so common, do not come from the human race.

4. We are now ready to inquire into the *true* cause of the phenomena of spiritual manifestations; and in answer to the question, From what source do they proceed? we answer—from DEMONS. Who are they? “The angels that sinned,” called also “evil angels,” “unclean spirits,” and “devils,” or, more properly, “demons.”

Who are the angels? An order of beings higher than men, who were created before the human race. When speaking of the origin of man, the Psalmist addresses the Lord and says:—“Thou hast made him *a little lower than the angels.*” Then it follows that the angels existed *before* men, and are a little higher. Man could not be “made . . . a little lower than the angels,” when there were none in existence. This proves that angels are not the spirits of men; for if they were, then there could be no angels till some men died; but when the *first* man was created, he was made “a little lower than the angels” who were then in existence.

The angels were on probation. This is evident from the fact that some of them “sinned.” 2 Pet. 2: 4. Those that “kept . . . their first estate” are called the “holy angels,” or “the angels of God”; while the “evil angels” (Ps. 78: 49) are called the devil’s “angels.”

The angels resemble men in their exterior form, and on this account have been mistaken for men. Hence

we read — “Be not forgetful to entertain strangers, for thereby some have entertained angels unawares.” — Heb. 13 : 2. This proves that they are not disembodied human spirits, as some claim ; because such could not eat and drink, and have their feet washed, as was the case with the angels who visited Lot and others. In relation to those it is said — “There came two angels to Sodom at even ; and Lot sat in the gate of Sodom ; and Lot seeing them, rose up to meet them ; and he bowed himself with his face to the ground ; and he said, Behold now, my lords, turn in, I pray you, into your servant’s house, and tarry all night, and wash your feet. . . . And they turned in unto him, and entered into his house ; and he made them a feast, and did bake unleavened bread, and they did eat.” — Gen. 19 : 1–3. This account proves very clearly that they are real persons, with tangible organisms, like men ; yet they are not made of *dust* as are men. This fact we learn from Jesus, who said, “A spirit hath not flesh and bones, as ye see me have.” — Luke 24 : 39. We read of Jesus — “He took not on him the nature of angels ; but he took on him the seed of Abraham” (Heb. 2 : 16) ; consequently, there is a difference between the nature of angels, and Christ. But the fact that angels are not “flesh and bones” or made of dust like men, does not prove that they have no personal organisms ; unless it be proved that every thing that is not made of “flesh and bones,” is an immaterial thing, which would be truly nothing. X A watch is not made of “flesh and bones,” but it is a tangible object, that may be handled. So with the angels. There are



many substances of which they may be formed, and not be "flesh and bones" like the Savior, who "took on him the seed of Abraham." We find no proof in the Bible that "a spirit," or an angel, is an immaterial being, or an etherial essence; but directly the opposite is most clearly taught,—that they are as truly real persons as are men; and so resemble them in their form, that they have been mistaken for human beings.

The *good* angels never have claimed that they were the spirits of men, or that they ever lived on our earth. They have always come on important business, spoken in harmony with the Bible, and have appeared in their own persons, instead of choosing some medium through whom to operate.

The angels have power to render themselves invisible, or to be seen by us, as they may choose. This is shown in the case of Balaam, when he was riding to a certain place for the purpose of cursing the children of Israel. When on his journey, "the angel of the Lord stood in the way for an adversary against him." The animal he was riding "saw the angel," and endeavored to go around him. This was attempted several times, which caused Balaam to get angry at his beast, and to smite it with "a staff." After that, "the eyes of Balaam were opened, and he saw the angel."—Num. 22.

We now see that angels are a class of beings higher than men, resembling them in their exterior form, but not formed of dust like men; that they were on probation, and some of them sinned and were afterwards called "evil angels," "unclean spirits," or "demons." We can see no way to avoid this conclusion only to deny the Bible.



We are aware that some hold that demons are nothing more than men's *propensities*; but we think a very little examination of the Scriptures on this point is sufficient to show that it is opposed to the Bible.

In James 2:19, we read—"Thou believest that there is one God; thou doest well; the devils also *believe and tremble*." It cannot be said of men's *propensities* that they "*believe and tremble*." Again, the demons were the first to declare that Jesus was the true Messiah; by saying, "Thou art Christ the Son of God." And he rebuking them suffered them not to *speak*, for *they knew* that he was Christ."—Luke 4:41. Is there any ground for saying that these were human *propensities* that were talking about Christ? We think such an idea is so absurd, that the candid have only to look at it to cause them to reject it.

Some claim that demons are the spirits of wicked *men*; and that the spiritual manifestations proceed from them. But those who hold this position, so far as we know, also teach that when wicked men die, their spirits go into "hell torment." We would like to ask the advocates of this view, how these wicked spirits of men got out of hell so as to come and visit their friends here upon the earth? Did they break out? or has the Lord let them out before the day of judgment? We wait for an answer; and remark in passing, that the demons of the Bible are never called human spirits; but are always spoken of as wicked beings, who are lying and "seducing spirits," co-operating with the Devil—the Prince of demons.

We next inquire, Where do these demons dwell?

In 2 Pet. 2: 4, we read, "God spared not the angels that sinned, but cast them down to hell, and delivered them into chains of darkness, to be reserved unto judgment." Where is the *hell* in which they are "reserved unto judgment"? We would state that the word TARTARUS, here rendered "hell," occurs no where else in the Bible. Then, if we can ascertain the meaning of *Tartarus* in this passage, we shall know where the demons "are reserved unto judgment."

How shall we best ascertain the meaning of *Tartarus*? It is not the place where wicked men go at death, for they go to *Sheol* or *Hades*. It is not the place where the wicked are to be finally punished, for that is in *Gehenna*. The word is not used to represent the abode of men in any condition; it is only applied to "the angels that sinned." Where is this *Tartarus*? Who will inform us? If we ask the heathen, some of them will tell us it is a place so deep in the earth that it will take a mass of iron nine days to fall to it, and when we get there we should find a place surrounded "by a river of fire, and by a triple wall, and guarded by a *three-headed dog*." They also taught that in this place is one Sisyphus trying to roll a stone to the top of a hill, which he will never succeed in accomplishing; another is doomed to perpetual thirst, in sight of *plenty* of water; another is continually treading upon a revolving wheel; another has a "vulture eternally devouring his entrails," etc., etc., all of which can only pass for heathen fables.

But the ancient Greeks also gave the word quite a different signification, which harmonizes with the Bible.



“Dr. Wm. Ramsey, an able and learned writer, says : ‘The word *Tartarus* means, according to *Greek writers*, in a *physical sense*, the bounds or verge of this material system.’ . . . Dr. R. remarks, ‘That place is, probably, at present, within the atmosphere of our earth.’

“The learned Ralph Cudworth, D. D., in his ‘Intellectual System,’ vol. iii. p. 363, while speaking of Peter’s remark, says : — ‘And by *Tartarus* here, in all probability, is meant this lower caliginous (i. e., *dark*) air, or *atmosphere* of the earth, according to that of St. Austin concerning these angels, ‘That after their sin, they were thrust down into the *misty darkness of this lower air.*’ (*De Gen. ad Lit. lib. 3, cap. 10.*)”

Suidas, an ancient writer, says it signifies “the place in the clouds,” or, “in the air.” It will be remembered that it is said of the great leader of the hosts who are opposed to the Lord, that he is “the prince of the power of the air.” — Eph. 2 : 2. The Scriptures also tell us of “the rulers of the darkness of this world,” and of “spiritual wickedness in high places” ; or, more literally, “wicked spirits in aerial regions.”

Dr. Parkhurst, the lexicographer, says : — “It appears from a passage in Lucian, that by *Tartarus* was meant, in a *physical sense*, the bounds of this material creation.”

Empedocles says : — “Our dull, lack-lustre globe is the doomed haunt and dungeon of evil angels, envious and malignant demons.”

Dr. Whately says : — “The word used by Peter, which our translators render ‘cast down to hell,’ or ‘*Tartarus*,’ is to be understood of our dark, gloomy earth, with its dull clouds, foul vapors, and misty atmosphere. . . . Socrates called the abyss, or sea, *Tartarus*, as does also Plato, who elsewhere calls our



dim, lack-lustre earth itself also *Tartarus*. Plutarch says our air . . . is called *Tartarus*, from being cold. Herein he is followed and supported by Lucian. And both Hesiod and Homer call it the 'aerial *Tartarus*.' In no other sense or way can St. Peter be understood and explained." Lucian says, "The great depth of the air is called *Tartarus*."

Grotius, an ancient and learned writer says: "That is called *Tartarus* which is lowest in anything; whether in the earth, or in the water, or, as here, in the air."

We think the point is now clearly established, that the word *Tartarus* in 2 Pet. 2: 4, signifies the regions round about this earth. When Jesus was here, he frequently encountered the demons. As they were then in *Tartarus*, it follows that the word signifies "the bounds or verge of this material creation," as stated by Dr. Parkhurst, and not a place in the midst of the earth or sea. Had Jesus been in the sea, or in the earth, when talking with them, then there might be some reason to think that *Tartarus* meant the "lowest" part of the one in which he was situated; but as he was upon the earth, in the "airy *Tartarus*," none other could be meant.

Having found the locality of the demons, or "the angels that sinned," and that they are here "reserved unto judgment," we now pass to inquire, What are they doing, and how do they accomplish their work? This will lead us, we think, to the true explanation of all the spiritual manifestations.

In answer to the inquiry, "What are they doing?" the Bible informs us they are "seducing" people, causing them to "depart from the faith" once delivered

to the saints;" "speaking lies in hypocrisy," and opposed to the marriage laws of the country. — 1 Tim. 4: 1-3. They are "deceiving" men and women "by the means . . . of miracles; and leading a multitude to adopt "doctrines of devils" instead of the truth of the Bible.

We now come to the inquiry, *How* do they perform their wonderful works? We shall let the spirits themselves, and their followers, answer this question. It is well known that the best physical manifestations are obtained in darkened rooms. Some opposers of Spiritualism have claimed that the reason why they wished the rooms darkened was in order that the medium, and those forming the circle, might practise their trickery successfully. It may have that appearance, but facts, we think, will not sustain such a theory. We shall find there is a philosophical reason why the best exhibitions are given in a darkened room. When Mrs. Cora Hatch was lecturing in Boston, in a trance state, she was asked "to explain why it is necessary that the room should be darkened when wonderful phenomena are performed in the presence of certain mediums?" The answer returned by the spirit was as follows:—"The action of *light* agitates, dissipates, or in some way so disturbs the fluid, gas, magnetism, or whatever the instrumentality be called, which is employed by spirits in acting upon grosser matter, that they are unable to control and employ it." — *The Spiritualist* of Aug. 15th, 1857, edited and published by A. E. Newton.

From the foregoing we may come to the conclusion that the demons employ the same agent that a mesmer-



izer does when he controls his subjects. In answer to the question, "What, then, is a distinction between Mesmerism and Spiritualism?" we find the following in the *Spiritual Age* of April 3d, 1858:—"Mesmerism is something which a man does while he has his *clothes on*; Spiritualism is a similar act of his *after his clothes have been put off*. [By *clothes*, they mean *body*.—ED.] Suppose *I* magnetize *you* to-day; and that I, the mesmerizer, speak, write, act, through you, you being unconscious;—this is Mesmerism. Suppose, further, that I die to-night; and that, to morrow, I, a spirit, come and magnetize you, and then speak, write, act, through you; this is Spiritualism."

This explanation is very plain, showing that the spirits use the same agency to move their mediums that is used by mesmerizers. We think this position is fully sustained by an abundance of facts. The mistake of the Spiritualists consists in supposing that the "familiar spirits" are human, instead of being demons, as the Bible shows.

In the *Banner of Light*, July 30th, 1857, we find the following:—

"The correctness of communications from spirits, through trance mediums, depends upon the more or less perfect mesmeric control the spirit has of the medium or subject. We have been able to discover little difference in the control a spirit takes of a trance medium, and that taken of a subject by a good mesmerizer, though undoubtedly the power of the spirit to control the medium's mind is stronger, and the will more effective in using the organs."

No doubt the mind of a demon is stronger than that of a human being.

In the *Banner of Light* for Aug. 22nd, 1863, w

find the following account of questions put to a spirit, and the answers returned : —

Q. How do we understand that spirits control an organism ?

A. We have just informed you that they do so by means of the magnetic aura, or animal magnetism.

Q. Do spirits concentrate their power upon the brain and nerves ?

A. Sometimes on the nervous system. In cases of mechanical writing, power is concentrated upon the ganglion of the arm, and is not at all connected with the brain. In cases of entire physical control, then it pervades the entire physical body."

At a Spiritualist circle held at the office of the *Banner of Light*, in Boston, May 2nd, 1864, the communicating spirit was asked, "What is the *modus operandi* of controlling a *medium* ?"

The spirit answered : — "As a free intelligence, or spirit, who by nature has no right to the medium's body, my first step is to come and hold communion with the spirit who owns the body. The result of that communion is not transmitted to the external senses of the medium, but to the internal ; therefore it is quite as tangible, as real, to the spirit, as it could be to the external. I ask that spirit, 'Will you yield me up the control of your mortal form for a short time ?' The answer is generally, 'I will.' . . . The spirit is subjected to the entire control of the predominating spirit. It is, in a word, magnetized by the spirit ; held in perfect subjection. And it seems to sleep ; and it does sleep, so far as external life is concerned."

The following questions and answers will develop some of the philosophy of Spiritualism. So far as we know, the spirits admit that they operate in the same



way as a mesmerizer, when he would obtain control over his subject. In the *Banner of Light*, Feb. 4th, 1865, we find the following record of a conversation with a spirit:—

“Q. What is the process of induction of a subject by a developing medium?”

A. Well, the process is a changing of the magnetic and electric condition of the subject under a course of treatment. For instance, there may be a superabundance of magnetism. The developing spirit endeavors to equalize the forces, or to bring about an electrical and magnetic condition that shall be adapted to the return of the disembodied spirits, and the making of various manifestations.

Q. Are these changes effected by the brain?

A. No; the nervous system is generally first affected, then the system entire; not simply the centre, but the system entire.

Q. Has the spirit any other way of manifesting itself except through the brain or nervous instruments?

A. Yes.

Q. Where a spirit controls the hand of a medium to write, is the impression always made through the brain?

A. Sometimes the control is what is termed mechanical control; then the connection between arm and brain is entirely severed, and yet the manifestation is made through what is called the nervous fluids, a certain portion of which is retained in the arm for the purpose of action. But when the manifestation is what is called an impressional manifestation, then the brain and entire nervous system is used.”

We think we now understand *how* the spirits operate; that is, by a *mesmeric* influence. We understand that this is the means by which Satan influences the minds of people, when he makes an effort to lead

them away from the road to life eternal. It is a spiritual power proceeding from him and his demons, by means of which he influences their minds more or less. When they yield themselves up wholly to his control, then they may become mediums through whom he may write and speak, and perform other strange things. This has been practiced among the heathen nations for centuries. In opposition to this, the Lord operates upon the minds of men by means of the Holy Spirit; and when we yield fully to him, then he fills us with his Spirit, which has moved holy men to write and speak what the Lord would have said to the people. When we are filled with his Spirit, we are led to act in harmony with the requirements of the Bible,—to love our enemies and be kind to all. When we are under the spiritual influence of Satan, or become filled with his spirit, then we are ready to deny the Bible, and act in opposition to the Lord's requirements. Hence, those who become followers of the sprits, or demons, are led at once into infidelity, and to reject Christ as our Savior. They may admit that Jesus was a good man—a great medium—but deny he was the Son of God any more than George Washington, Socrates, or Plato. In short, they are the enemies of the cross of Christ. Satan is bringing all his wiles into exercise, and transforming himself into an angel of light, by teaching good morals through some of his mediums, in order to obtain the confidence of good people, till he can seduce them away from the truth. It is the most complete, and, consequently, the most dangerous counterfeit of christianity ever devised.



Having learned from the testimony of the spirits and their followers that they operate just as "a good mesmerizer" does, it now remains to be shown how a mesmerizer performs his wonderful manifestations. When this is understood, we think the whole will be plain.

In mesmerism we know that the objects seen by the persons under mesmeric control are not *real* objects, present at the time, but only exist in the mind of the operator. To explain this point, let us take a case. When in Chicago, Ill., in 1864, we gathered the following facts, which are but a sample of myriads that might be given to illustrate the phenomena of mesmerism.

Dr. Blain, son of Eld. J. Blain, attended a lecture on Mesmerism. At the close of the lecture, the speaker desired those to present themselves that were willing to be mesmerized, provided the speaker could do it. Dr. Blain submitted himself for trial, and was mesmerized. The operator then made the Dr. believe that he was about to amputate a limb. Accordingly, he went through the motions necessary to get out his surgical instruments, then prepared his subject for the operation, took his knife and cut through the flesh to the bone, then took his saw and sawed off the bone, then his knife again to cut off the remaining muscle; then got his needle and thread and took up the arteries, and so on till the wound was all done up nicely, when the operator exclaimed,—“all right,” and the Dr. came out of the mesmeric state.

While the Dr. was going through the movements

necessary for amputating the limb, it was a *reality* to him, as truly as it would have been had he taken it off when in his natural condition; and yet it was but a scene of deception; for at that time he had no limb to amputate, nor instruments with him for that purpose. How was this strange work accomplished? The operator formed a *mental picture* of the whole scene, in his own mind, and that became a *reality* to Dr. Blain. If the operator looks mentally at a rose, a bird, fish, serpent, or child; those objects in his *mind* become *real* objects to the one under his mesmeric control. The objects exist at the time only as *thoughts* in the mind of the operator; and he can represent the child or other object, to his mesmerized subject, in any form or dress he may choose, by simply *thinking* of it in the state he would have it appear to the one under his influence.

Now we come to the application of these facts to Spiritualism. Let it be borne in mind that all the spirits, and Spiritualists, so far as we know, are unanimous in teaching that *the spirits operate just as a mesmerizer does*. Having found how a mesmerizer performs his strange deeds, we are prepared to understand the wonders of Spiritualism. In order to make this point very plain, and confirm it beyond all controversy, we will quote a conversation with a spirit, as reported in the *Banner of Light*, of April 9th, 1864. The questions and answers were as follows:—

“Q. Is the flower as tangible to the disembodied in spirit-life as it is to us?

A. Flowers in the spirit-land take the form of



beautiful thoughts. Are they tangible? Yea, and far more tangible, far more real than the fleeting flowers of earth-life.

Q. Are there not real spirit-flowers, such as we are accustomed to seeing here?

A. No, there are not. Pardon us, if we have ruthlessly swept away the pleasant allusion, but some one must do this, sooner or later. Your own senses, mayhap, will do this.

Q. Why are they brought to us from the spirit-land, if they are not real flowers?

A. Because while you, as a spirit, are existing in the sensuous world, you weigh and measure all life through your physical senses, and can weigh and measure them in no other way. It is on this account that your spirit-friends find it necessary to meet you with symbols that can be comprehended by your physical senses. . . . They do not present them to deceive you, but your spirit-friends know perfectly well that you are living in that nature. Now, you have not passed beyond it, therefore all things that are presented to you from the spirit-world, must take the form of something that you are familiar with in this sensuous world.

Q. Will it not be with our spirit-friends as with flowers, when we get to the spirit-world—that we shall not know them?

A. You will recognize them, not by form and feature, surely, but by love—by that internal, all-powerful and God-given attraction that binds souls together.

Q. I cannot see how we shall know them hereafter.

A. Is love dependent upon form and feature?

Q. It is, if we realize our spirit-friends are continually near us; for we can think of them only as they looked to us when here.

A. True, you have not, nor has any one in the flesh, any clear idea of spirit-forms and scenes. It

is vain for us to present Spiritual ideas to mortality, unless those ideas be clothed with forms that you can comprehend."

It will be seen from the foregoing conversation with the spirit, that the flowers, birds, fields, groves, etc., about which the spirits talk so freely, exist "in the spirit-land" only as "beautiful *thoughts*;" consequently have no *real* existence. So we think it is with "the spirit-land" itself, of which we hear so much, and of which the Bible does not say one *word*. Still further, if the flowers, birds, rivers, gardens, groves and fields exist only as "beautiful *thoughts*," we may well ask,—"Will it not be with our spirit-*friends* as with *flowers*?" i. e., that they are no more really existing in a "spirit-land" than are the flowers and other objects which are seen by the mediums among Spiritualists?

Let us advance another step in this investigation, by quoting from the writings of Mr. A. E. Newton, formerly editor of the *Spiritual Age*, published in Boston. Mr. Newton is a noted Spiritualist, and as well qualified to speak on this subject, probably, as any one living, unless it be Andrew Jackson Davis. Mr. Newton says:—

1st. It is alleged to be possible and common for spirits of a certain class to assume the appearance and characteristics of other spirits, or of other persons still in the body, so completely that the disguise cannot be detected by ordinary spirit-seers. This may be so, and hence the common evidences of the identity of spirits are little to be relied on.

2d. When two persons are closely in sympathetic or magnetic rapport with each other, the images that



are in one mind may be perceived as objective realities by the other. This seems to be the case with the magnetizer and his subject, in the once common phenomenon of mesmerism. The operator forms an image, as of a person, a serpent, a fire, or any other object, in his own mind; when the subject, if well under control, instantly sees the same thing as an objective reality. So, positive minds in a circle, or positive spirits who are around, may present the image of any person with whom they are familiar, and it may appear as a reality to the impressible medium."

It will be seen, from the foregoing extract, that Mr. Newton very plainly states that the spirits operate just as a mesmerizer does, and also confirms all we have said on this part of the subject. Just as a mesmerizer makes his subject see men, women, children, birds, flowers, etc., which exist only as mental pictures in his mind; "So, . . . positive spirits, who are around, may present the image of *any* person with whom they are familiar, and it may appear as a reality to the impressible medium." What spirits are these doing this work? The spirits of *demons*, not human spirits. Then it follows that the only difference between Mesmerism and Spiritualism is simply this: in Mesmerism a *human* being is the operator, and in Spiritualism a *demon*. But in both cases the medium does not see any *real* friends, flowers, birds, or other objects; consequently it follows that our deceased friends are not present to make any communications, but another class of beings—the demons—are trying to make us believe that they themselves are our spirit-friends, by presenting mental pictures of them to their mediums, who, when

under their control, see these mental pictures as real persons, and describe them most minutely.

At this point we will introduce the testimony of Andrew Jackson Davis, formerly editor of the *Herald of Progress*, published in New York. In the *Herald* for Oct. 27th, 1860, he says:—

“It is known that a wise and strong-minded person in the spirit-world has the power to make visible to the eyes of mortals the exact appearance or semblance of the body it wore before death. This representation is elaborated sometimes to the minutest particular, even to the reproduction of the appearance of the habiliments, etc., by which the person was characterized and identified while a resident of the earth.”

Again he says, in the *Herald of Progress* for Feb. 1st, 1862:—

“All intelligent spirits are great artists. *They can psychologize a medium to see them*, and to describe them, in the style which would produce the deepest impression on the receiver. . . . They can easily represent themselves as being old or young, as in worldly dress or flowing robes, as is deemed best suited to accomplish the ends of the visitation.”

Now the whole secret and mystery of Spiritualism seems to be clearly revealed. All its characteristics harmonize with the idea that the demons mesmerize their mediums, and then “speak, write, act, through” them just as a mesmerizer does.

It is a well-known fact that a mesmerizer may control his medium when out of sight, and when at quite a distance from him. We heard Prof. Brittain state in one of his lectures that he had mesmerized a person at



the distance of one hundred and fifty miles. Demons, doubtless, can control a medium much further than a human being, because they have greater power than men.

We can now see how Mr. Partridge received his intelligence in Rochester, N. Y., that "Messrs. Finley, Johnson & Co., of San Francisco" had failed, before the news of the failure came by mail. The demons knew when the failure took place, and impressed their medium at Rochester to state the fact to Mr. Partridge, the demon claiming at the same time to be the spirit of Mr. Partridge's deceased brother, who died in California. When we come to examine the *doctrines* of Spiritualism, we shall see more clearly why the demons are so anxious to make us believe they are the spirits of our friends who have died.

We think it is now clearly shown, — the Spiritualists and spirits themselves being witnesses, — that the mediums do not see *real persons*, when under the control of a spirit, any more than one does when in a mesmeric state; but the mental pictures of the mesmerizer, whether a human being, or a demon, appear as real objects to the medium, and are described as such. If the demon has a distinct recollection of the looks of the individual called for, as in the case of Samuel, he can form a clear mental picture of the person, and then the medium sees him as a living being, and gives a minute description of him.

Having found out the CAUSE of the spiritual manifestations; that they are the work of *demons* operating through human agents, or mediums; and that the

spirits of our deceased friends have no part nor lot in the matter; we proceed to notice the principal objections to our position, which are urged by those who sustain Spiritualism.

1. Although the Spiritualists admit that many of the spirits are liars and deceivers; yet they claim that all are not bad spirits because some give good *advice*. This may be true. For instance; the spirits often advise their followers to leave off intoxicating drinks, tobacco, and unhealthy food, and give other good advice. It should be remembered that these are "SEDUCING SPIRITS."—1 Tim. 4: 1. How does a seducer go to work? Does he let his victim know that he is a seducer? Certainly not. How does he escape detection? By kind deeds and words, and good *advice*. In this way he gains the confidence of the one he would lead to ruin, so that he is followed by his victim, who suspects no evil, because of the "good advice." May not demons do in the same way? Such a course would be in perfect keeping with their character. This is just what constitutes them "seducing spirits."

We will give an example of their work. Many such might be given. We were acquainted with a devoted christian woman in South Boston, who was persuaded to attend a Spiritualist circle in company with several other professors of religion. The spirit requested them to read in the Scriptures, which they did. This led them to believe that a good spirit had come. They were then desired to pray. They had no further doubts but that the spirit of a christian was visiting them, and giving good instruction. Accord-



ingly, they went again and again. When the seducing spirit had fully gained their confidence, so that they believed all he said, he then endeavored to convince them that some portions of the Bible were not reliable. He continued his infidel objections till she, who was a devoted disciple of Jesus when she first visited the circle, became a medium, and laid her Bible away as of little or no value.

But suppose the seducing spirit should begin with a company of deists, instead of christians, would he say to them read the Bible and pray? Nay, verily. But he would lead them further on in unbelief, till he got them into practical atheism. These spirits *never* lead their followers to Jesus as their Savior, when they are allowed to finish their work.

2. Again it is objected against our position, that the medium imitates the *writing* of the deceased friend, therefore it must be his spirit. But a counterfeiter will imitate the writing of any individual he ever saw. Cannot a demon do as much as a man?

3. It is still objected that the *voice* of the departed friend is perfectly imitated by the medium, consequently it must be his spirit. But theatrical performers will imitate any voice they ever heard. Have demons less power to imitate?

It is the special work of these demons to deceive the human race, and make people believe they are the spirits of our departed friends, in order to lead men away from God and the Bible. If they would tell us who they were at first, no christian would be led to depart from the faith by their false teaching; but if

they can by any means lead us to believe that the spirit of a dear mother, father, companion, brother or sister, who died happy in the Lord, has come to visit us; of course we should not fear that they would guide us wrong, when they manifested so much interest in our welfare while living here. This constitutes the deception. They first pretend to be the spirits of dear friends, and to convince us of this they give us good advice, and thus seduce the people by their fair words; and step by step lead their followers away from the road to life eternal into the broad way to destruction. We think there is no surer way to eternal death than to follow the teachings of these "seducing spirits."



## CHAPTER II.

## THE MORALS OF SPIRITUALISM.

As the demons are the agents in all these spiritual manifestations, that purport to come from departed human spirits, their *moral influence* should correspond with their character. Its tendency should be downward, away from the holy religion of Jesus. Let us now attend to the facts in the case. Our proof will come from the spirits and the Spiritualists themselves.

We will first notice their *claims*. The following will be sufficient to set them clearly before the readers :—

“The Spiritualism of the present day is that which Jesus preached eighteen centuries ago.” “*Christianism* should then be synonymous with *Spiritualism*.” “The doctrines of Christ,” says a popular writer, “are to be re-established in their purity. This is to be done by Spiritualism, which embraces *all* that tends to elevate man, and will be to the New Testament what that was to the Old—a light thrown on its obscurities.”

A spirit, which professes to be that of John Adams, says :—

“I was happy . . . . in the religion of Christ which he taught eighteen hundred years ago—in Spiritualism as it is now called.”

Says Mr. Partridge, Editor of the *Spiritual Telegraph*, when speaking of the permanency of Spiritualism :—

“It is likely to pervade and *absorb* all denominations of christians, exert a moral and reformatory power

among the nations, and inaugurate the millennial era." "We feel that our advance will be irresistible, and our conquests *speedy* and *sure*. To Spiritualists is committed the gospel of the present age."

In the *Spiritual Age* of July 4th, 1857, we read:—

"Christianity and Spiritualism stand upon the same foundation. . . . Spiritualism has given it (Christianity) a vitality which it had not possessed before since the time of the apostles."

Spiritualism is called the "new gospel." After a lecture by Mrs. Laura McAlpine Cuppy, at Dodworth's Hall, New York, Sunday evening, Nov. 22d, 1863, the question was asked, "In what does the new gospel consist?"

ANSWER: "The new gospel, as we understand it, . . . is the philosophy of Spiritualism, so called, and the philosophy of Spiritualism embraces all the virtues, and strikes at the root of all evils, social, political, and religious." "There is one thing we know, viz., that we are by nature divine." "We have always asserted that there is not a single argument that can be brought against Spiritualism that is not competent as an argument against the christianity of the past—not one."

"Q. I understand the word 'gospel' to mean 'good news.'"

A. It does; and Spiritualism is good news—the best that ever came to earth."

Let us now call on witnesses who are competent to testify in this case. Let them tell us what is behind the curtain.

We will first introduce Dr. B. F. Hatch, formerly husband of the noted trance-speaking medium, Mrs. Cora V. Hatch, now Mrs. Daniels. The Dr. traveled



extensively with his wife while she was giving lectures on Spiritualism. He says :—

“The extensive opportunity which I have had, and that too among the first class of Spiritualists, of learning its nature and results, I think will enable me to lay just claims to being a competent witness in the matter.

“I am aware that what I have to say will offend many who are less acquainted with the whole phenomena than myself, and such as may feel themselves involved, and will please others ; but it is for neither purpose that I write, but that the inexperienced may more fully comprehend the dangers attending it. I am frequently asked if I still believe in the phenomena of Spiritualism ? I answer, Yes. I should deem it more than a waste of time to write about what does not exist. . . . But through it all, I believe that there is a powerful influx of an infernal error into nearly all mediumistic minds which greatly corrupts the moral sensibility and proves almost universally most disastrous to its victims.

“I have heard much of the improvement in individuals in consequence of a belief in Spiritualism. With such I have had no acquaintance. But I have known many whose integrity of character and uprightness of purpose rendered them worthy examples to all around, but who, on becoming mediums, and giving up their individuality, also gave up every sense of honor and decency. A less degree of severity in this remark will apply to a large class of both mediums and believers. There are thousands of high-minded and intelligent Spiritualists who will agree with me that it is no slander in saying that the inculcation of no doctrines in this country has ever shown such disastrous moral and social results as the spiritual theories. . . . Iniquities which have justly received the condemnation of centuries are openly upheld ; vices which would destroy every wholesome regulation of society

are crowned as virtues ; prostitution is believed to be fidelity to self ; marriage an outrage on freedom ; love evanescent, and, like the bee, should sip the sweets wherever found ; bastards are claimed to be spiritually begotten. All change, of whatever nature, is believed to be an improvement, as there is no retrogression. Iniquity is only the effervescence of the outworkings of a heavenly destiny. God is shorn of his personality and becomes simply a permeating principle, the Bible a libel on common sense, and Christ a mere medium, hardly equal to the spiritual babies of 'this more progressive age.'

"With such doctrines before us, what have we to hope? That they are rapidly increasing no one can deny. The end is not yet.

"The most damning iniquities are everywhere perpetrated in Spiritual circles, a very small per centage of which ever comes to public attention. I care not whether it be Spiritual or mundane, the facts exist, and should demand the attention and just condemnation of an intelligent community. Look at the iniquities which have been committed within the past two weeks in this city, and that too by Spiritual mediums who claim to be controlled by angels. It is worse than useless to talk to the Spiritualist against this condition of things, for those who occupy the highest position among them, are aiding and abetting in all classes of iniquities which prevail amongst them. The abrogation of marriage, bigamy, accompanied by robbery, theft, rapes, are all chargeable to Spiritualism. I most solemnly affirm that I do not believe that there has, during the past five hundred years, arisen any class of people who were guilty of so great a variety of crimes and indecencies as the Spiritualists of America.

"For a long time I was swallowed up in its whirlpool of excitement, and comparatively paid but little attention to its evils, believing that much good might



result from the openings of the avenues of Spiritual intercourse. But during the past eight months I have devoted my attention to a critical investigation of its moral, social, and religious bearing, and I stand appalled before the revelations of its awful and damning realities, and would flee from its influence as I would from the miasma which would destroy both soul and body. Spiritualism and prostitution, with a rejection of Christianity, are twin sisters, which everywhere go hand in hand. With but little inquiry, I have been able to count up over seventy mediums, most of whom have wholly abandoned their conjugal relations, others living with their paramours called 'affinities,' others in promiscuous adultery, and still others exchanged partners. Old men and women, who have passed the meridian of life, are not unfrequently the victims of this hallucination. Many of the mediums lose all sense of moral obligations, and yield to whatever influence may for the time be brought to bear upon them. Their pledges, the integrity of their oaths, are no more reliable than the shifting breezes of the whirlwind, for they are made to yield to the powers which for the time control them."

Dr. T. L. Nichols, a distinguished Spiritualist, when speaking of the mission of Spiritualism, says:—

"Spiritualism meets, neutralizes, and destroys christianity. A Spiritualist is no longer a christian in any popular sense of the term. Advanced spirits do not teach....the atonement of Christ; nothing of the kind."—Nichols' "*Monthly Magazine of Social Science and Progressive Literature*," for Nov. 1854, p. 66.

Let it be remembered that the foregoing is from *advanced* Spiritualists, who are well qualified to testify, because they have seen and heard for themselves. This testimony corresponds with the position we have taken; that is, that Spiritualism originated with the Devil and

his angels, or demons. All thus far appears harmonious with this view of the manifestations.

We proceed to examine other witnesses relative to the *moral* tendency of Spiritualism. Our next witness is Dr. P. B. Randolph, a noted lecturer on Spiritualism, who has been, he says, "in a trance state about two thousand five hundred times," and is probably as well prepared to speak of the moral tendency of Spiritualism as any other man.

In 1858 he was led to renounce Spiritualism.\* We make the following extracts from a sermon preached by him on Sunday, Nov. 21st, 1858, in Clinton Hall, N. Y., and published in the *New York Tribune*. He says:—

"For nearly ten years have I been seeking rest for my weary soul. But rest came not until I sought it earnestly at the family altar, surrounded by those whom, in the delirium of mad philosophy, I thought were not for me, but whom I subsequently found dearer, nearer, truer than all the world beside. \* \* \*

"Spiritualism is all eye and head, no soul and heart; all intellect, no emotions; all philosophy, no religion; all spirit, no God! And even the social reformatory movement has dwindled down into *prostitutional nurseries*!

"I enter the arena as the champion of common sense, against what in my soul *I believe to be the most tremendous enemy of God, morals and religion, that ever found foothold on the earth—the most seductive, hence most dangerous, form of sensualism that ever cursed a nation, age or people.*

"I was a medium about eight years, during which time I made three thousand speeches, and traveled

---

\* He has since been drawn back into it again.



over several different countries, proclaiming the new gospel. I now regret that so much excellent breath was wasted, and that my health of mind and body was well nigh ruined. I have only begun to regain both since I totally abandoned it, and to-day had rather see the cholera in my house than be a Spiritual medium.

\* \* \* In a moment of despair, . . . with dreadful intent, I severed the blood vessels of both arms in four places. Chance led a man to approach me ere the lamp of life had quite gone out, and by superhuman exertions I was saved. All this I charge to demonism and the infernal doctrines taught by many invisibles. . . . . *The anti-Bible, anti-God, anti-Christian Spiritualism*, I had perfectly demonstrated to be subversive, unrighteous, destructive, disorderly, and irreligious; consequently to be shunned by every true follower of God and holiness. . . . .

“For seven years I held daily intercourse with what purported to be my mother’s spirit. *I am now firmly persuaded that it was nothing but an evil spirit and infernal demon, who in that guise gained my soul’s confidence, and led me to the very brink of ruin.* . . . Five of my friends destroyed themselves, and I attempted it by direct Spiritual influences. Every crime in the calendar has been committed by mortals moved by viewless beings! Adultery, fornication, suicides, desertions, unjust divorces, prostitution, abortion, insanity, are not evil, I suppose! I charge all these to this scientific Spiritualism. . . . It has banished peace from happy families, separated husbands and wives, and shattered the intellect of thousands. . . . It is *Godless, non-religious, opposed to the Bible*, and all ecclesiastical organizations. It is subversive of human dignity and public morals; is destructive of all we hold most dear and cherish most sacredly. It robs us of faith in Christ without giving us a substitute. It robs us of our refuge of religion, and cultivates the intellect at the expense of the heart.” . . . .

The following, from Dr. Randolph, was published in the *Banner of Light*, the leading Spiritualist paper:—

“I have a volume of sixty closely written pages, of names of those who have been drawn down from respectability, morality, wealth and intelligence, to the filth of free love, poverty, and to insanity itself.

“Spiritualism is a synonym of all falsities and lies; a cloak for all kinds of crimes—adultery, murder and lust; it weakens man’s intellect and individuality; changes his worship of God to a worship of ghosts.”

The foregoing statements set Spiritualism in its true moral aspect. No truer words were ever spoken than that Spiritualism is “anti-Bible, anti-God, anti-christian,” and should “be shunned by every true follower of God and holiness.” It is “anti-Christ” in its fullest sense.

Our next witness is Mr. Joel Tiffany, a man who has been a champion in Spiritualism, and probably as well prepared to speak intelligently upon the subject as any man in our country. He says:—

“After all of our investigations for seven or eight years, we must say, that we have as much evidence that they are lying spirits as we have that there are any spirits at all. . . . The doctrines they teach . . . are mostly contradictory and absurd. . . . There are those . . . who have become and are becoming victims to a sensual philosophsy, under the influence of what is termed Spiritualism. . . . Spiritualism, in a very large class of minds, tends to beget a kind of moral and religious atheism.”

Mr. T. L. Harris, a very intelligent Swedenborgian minister, who became a Spiritualist, and lectured in Europe, said, as reported in the *London Advertiser*:—

“The marriage vow imposes no obligations in the



views of Spiritualists. Husbands who had for years been so devotedly attached to their wives, that they have said nothing in the world but death itself could part them, have abandoned their wives, and formed criminal connection with other females, because the spirits have told them that there was a greater Spiritualist affinity between these husbands and certain other women, than between them and their lawful wives. Wives, too, the most devoted and loving, and true to their husbands, that had ever contracted the marriage obligation, had left their husbands and children, and lived in open immorality with other men, because the spirits had told them that they ought to do so, on the ground of there being a greater Spiritualist sympathy between them and these men, than between them and their husbands."

All this is in harmony with the idea that these spirits are demons, and opposed to Christ and his word. They are just what the apostle calls them, — "seducing spirits." While they *profess* to be christian, they are most emphatically anti-christian, and never lead any to Christ, but thousands away from him to the rankest infidelity.

We pass to notice some further facts relative to the *moral* tendency of Spiritualism. We have read its *claims*, and found them very high; but there is abundant proof to show that instead of its being "ancient christianity revived," it is the worst enemy christianity ever had to meet. We believe it to be Satan's last grand effort to substitute a false for the true christianity. His snares are laid most ingeniously; and, unless very watchful, ere people are aware of it, they will be caught in some of his traps. Thousands and millions are

already his deluded victims, and, like a terrible tornado, he is sweeping with destruction on every side. Occasionally we hear a warning voice from one who has escaped from his power, like a mariner from the sinking wreck; but most, after they once get into the Spiritualist "circle," are like the boatman under the control of the terrible whirlpool on the coast of Norway,—destruction is sure.

The next witness we introduce is Mr. J. F. Whitney, Editor of the New York *Pathfinder*. He was formerly a warm advocate of Spiritualism, and published much in its favor. He says:—

"Now, after a long and constant watchfulness, seeing for months and years its progress and its practical workings upon its devotees, its believers, and its mediums, we are compelled to speak our honest conviction, which is, that the manifestations coming through the acknowledged mediums, who are designated as rapping, tipping, writing, and entranced mediums, have a baneful influence upon believers, and create discord and confusion; that the generality of these teachings inculcate false ideas, approve of selfish, individual acts, and endorse theories and principles which, when carried out, *debase and make them little better than the brute.*"

Again he says:—"Seeing as we have the gradual progress it makes with its believers, particularly its mediums, from lives of *morality* to those of *sensuality* and *immorality*, gradually and cautiously undermining the foundations of good principles, we look back with amazement to the radical change which a few months will bring about in individuals."

He says in conclusion:—"We desire to send forth our warning voice; and if our humble position as the head of a public journal, our known advocacy of Spiritualism, our experience, and the conspicuous part we



have played among its believers; the honesty and the fearlessness with which we have defended the subject, will weigh any thing in our favor, we desire that our opinions may be received, and those who are moving passively down the rushing rapids to destruction, should pause, ere it be too late, and save themselves from the blasting influence which those manifestations are causing."

**"FORBIDDING TO MARRY."**

Among other instruction of the spirits, the apostle Paul has assured us that they will be opposed to the marriage laws,—“forbidding to marry.”—1 Tim. 4 : 3.

At the Rutland (Vt.) Reform Spiritualist Convention, held in June 1858, the following resolution was presented and defended :—

*Resolved*, That the only true and natural marriage is an exclusive conjugal love between one man and one woman; and the only true home is the isolated home, based upon this exclusive love."

The careless reader may see nothing objectionable in the resolution; but please read it again, and observe what constitutes *marriage*, according to the resolution,—“an exclusive conjugal LOVE between one man and one woman.” The poison sentiment is covered up by the word “*one*.” What constitutes marriage now, according to the laws of the land? Do we understand that when we see a notice of a marriage in a paper, which took place at a certain time and place, that then the parties began to love each other exclusively? Certainly not; but at that time their love was sanctioned by the proper authorities, and thus they became husband and wife. But the resolution states that the

marriage should consist in the "exclusive conjugal love." Then it follows, when either party loves another *exclusively*, the first marriage is dissolved, and they are married again; and if the other one does not happen to find a spiritual "affinity," then there is no alternative left but to make the best of it, as many have been compelled to do. According to this resolution one is married as often as his love becomes "*exclusive*" for any particular individual. This is one item in the boasted "new social order," which the spirits propose to establish when the political power is in their hands. It is called by them the "Divine Law of Marriage." A large number of Spiritualists are already carrying out this resolution practically, regardless of the laws of the land.

A similar resolution was presented at the National Spiritual Convention held in Chicago, from Aug. 9th to 14th, 1864. It was offered by Dr. A. G. Parker, of Boston, Chairman of the committee on social relations. This point is strongly urged by the spirits and Spiritualists.

At the Rutland Reform Convention, which closed June 27th, 1858, the resolution under consideration was earnestly advocated by able men and women. Said Mrs. Julia Branch of New York, as reported in the *Banner of Light*, July 10th, 1858, when speaking on the resolution: —

"I am aware that I have chosen almost a forbidden subject; forbidden from the fact that any one who *can* or *dare* look the marriage question in the face, candidly and openly denouncing the institution as the sole cause



of woman's degradation and misery, are objects of suspicion, of scorn, and opprobrious epithets."

She further remarked in the defense of the resolution, and the rights of women, — "She must demand her freedom; her right to receive the equal wages of man in payment for her labor; *her right to have children when she will, and by whom.*"

The Spiritualists established an institution at Berlin Heights, Ohio, adopting "free love" as the law of marriage. In the *Age of Freedom*, published there, we find an article denouncing marriage as an "odious monopoly of the opposite sex," and expressing a hope that the institution will be wholly abolished, and men and women be brought together according to the "passional attractions" of the moment. This means nothing, and can mean nothing, practically, but indiscriminate and debasing lust.

"The *Detroit Free Press* gives an account of a young married lady of that city, who, through the influence of a female relative, acting under the inspiration of the 'harmonial philosophy,' was induced to abandon her husband and go with her to the free love community at Berlin Heights, Ohio. Her husband did not ascertain for several weeks whither she had fled. When he learned where she had gone he was greatly distressed, but went at once for her, and found her perfectly willing to go home. She had seen quite enough of free love.

"When there, she found the marvelous 'love cure' but another name for all that is degrading and loathsome to a virtuous and high-minded woman. Low-bred familiarities with vulgar, fanatical men; companionship with women who deemed themselves elevated above humanity in becoming the victims of their own and their companions' lusts, and a close familiarity with a

brutish, criminal enjoyment, which was the highest sphere aimed at in this delectable community, were what she was obliged to submit to."

Mrs. Annie Hunter, whose husband founded the institution at Berlin Heights, writes from Jefferson, Ashtabula Co., O., June 5th, 1858, as follows:—

"MR. EDITOR:—I saw an article in the *Ashtabula Telegraph*, a few days since, taken from your paper, giving an account of the rescue of a young and lovely woman by her husband from the den of infamy at Berlin. I do not know the name of this lady or her husband, but my earnest prayer to God is, that she may never be led into such a temptation again, or be brought to know the depths of sorrow and degradation which that same infamous creed has brought upon me. Let her thank a kind Providence that she is restored to the arms of a loving and kind-hearted husband, and is not this moment, as I am, a deserted and heart-stricken wife and mother, dependent upon my daily labor for the pittance which supports my little ones, and keeps starvation from our door.

"My husband was the founder of the Berlin Free-love Institution. He has been a believer in that free-love doctrine for about three years. A year ago or more he left home, ostensibly upon business, but he only roamed around in search of free-love companions, having found a small number of which, he took them to Berlin and founded the infamous den of lust which now exists there. He left me with three little children to provide for, and nothing to do it with but my hands. I have stood for four days in the week over the wash-tub, laboring until my strength has many a time given way entirely, for the sake of a little money with which to feed my children."

In a speech at the Spiritual Convention at Ravenna, Ohio, July 4th and 5th, 1857, Mrs. Lewis said,—"To



confine her to love one man was an abridgment of her rights. . . . Although she had one husband in Cleveland, she considered herself married to the whole human race. All men were her husbands, and she had an undying love for them. What business is it to the world whether one man is the father of my children, or ten men are! I have a right to say who shall be the father of my offspring."

A few years since a remarkable book appeared, called the "Educator." It is an octavo volume of 680 pp., which consists of instruction purporting to come from the higher order of spirits, and was given through the medium of one known as the Rev. John Spear. The book was edited by Mr. A. E. Newton, of Boston, who was editor of the *Spiritual Age*. This Mr. Spear became the father of an illegitimate child, by the direction of the spirits. The following defense of the conduct of the parties appeared on the editorial page of the *Spiritual Telegraph*, Dec. 18th, 1858, edited and published by Mr. Charles Partridge, of New York, though the editor himself did not approve of the course of Mr. Spear. The defense reads as follows:—

"It is reserved for this our day, under the inspiration of the Spirit-world, for a quiet, equable, retiring woman, to rise up in the dignity of her womanhood, and declare in the face of her oppressors and a scowling world, *I will be free* . . . And no man, or set of men, no church, no state, shall withhold from me the realization of that purest of all aspirations inherent in every true woman, the right to re-beget myself *when, and by whom, and under such circumstances, as to me seems fit and best.*"

We will close the evidence on the moral tendency of Spiritualism by introducing the testimony of Dr.

Wm. B. Potter. He has had much experience in Spiritualism, and is well qualified to speak on the subject. An article from his pen, under the heading of

“ASTOUNDING FACTS!!”

says:—“We have through our own mediumship and that of others, had ‘Spirit manifestations,’ which the most *careful* and *rigidly scientific* investigations have shown, *beyond all* doubt or possibility of mistake, to be of spirit origin. *Fifteen years of critical study* of Spiritual Literature, an extensive acquaintance with the leading Spiritualists, and a patient, systematic and thorough investigation of the manifestations, for many years, enable us to speak from *actual knowledge*, definitely and positively of ‘*Spiritualism as it is.*’ Spiritual Literature is *full* of the most *insidious* and *seductive* doctrines, calculated to undermine the very foundations of morality and virtue, and lead to the most *unbridled licentiousness.*”

“We are told that ‘we must have charity,’ that it is wrong to blame any one, that we must not expose iniquity as ‘it will harden the guilty,’ that ‘none should be punished,’ that ‘man is a machine and not to blame for his conduct,’ that ‘there is no high, no low, no good, no bad,’ that ‘sin is a lesser degree of righteousness,’ that ‘nothing we can do can injure the soul or retard its progress,’ that ‘those who act the *worst* will progress the fastest,’ that ‘*lying* is right, *slavery* is right, *murder* is right, *adultery* is right,’ that ‘*whatever is, is right.*’ That sexual union is necessary for health and development; that it is a great help to mediums to get ‘Spiritual elements,’ but if the parties are not adapted, it is a great injury and an ‘awful wrong;’ that ‘as persons develop they *become* unadapted, and poison each other,’ that ‘*VARIETY is more productive of mental and physical development.*’

“Hardly can you find a Spiritual book, paper, lecture or communication, that does not contain some of these



pernicious doctrines, *in disguise*, if not openly. Hundreds of families have been broken up, and many affectionate wives deserted by 'Affnity-seeking' husbands. Many once devoted wives have been seduced, and left their husbands, and *tender, helpless children*, to follow some 'higher attraction.' Many well-disposed, but simple-minded girls, have been deluded by 'Affinity' notions and led off by 'Affinity hunters,' to be deserted, in a few months, with blasted reputations, or led to deeds still more *dark and criminal*, to hide their shame.

"It is a notorious fact, that leading teachers, noted mediums, and popular speakers, have deserted companions, obtained divorces, gone off with 'Affinities,' or practiced *promiscuous* intercourse to get 'Spiritual element,' or to 'impart vital magnetism for the cure of disease.' The outside world has no just conception of the folly, 'Free Love,' and licentiousness among Spiritualists; especially on the part of 'healing' and 'developing mediums.' We could give the *names of hundreds*, but for the present we spare them.

"At the National Convention of Spiritualists at Chicago, called to consider the question of a national organization, the only plan approved by its committee especially provided that NO CHARGE should EVER be entertained against any member, and that ANY person, without ANY regard to moral character, might become a member. Notorious 'Free-Lovers' and libertines have been especial and HONORED correspondents of Spiritual papers. Conventions of Spiritualists have accepted as delegates, and elected to office well known, *persistent, habitual* LIBERTINES. The late National Convention of Spiritualists at Philadelphia, through its committee, refused to even read a proposition to disfellowship known libertines, but formed a permanent, national organization with annual delegated Conventions, from which the lowest and most BEASTLY LICENTIOUSNESS SHALL NOT EXCLUDE ANY ONE."

In a work by Dr. Potter, entitled "Spiritualism as it is," when speaking of the "tendencies" of Spiritualism, he says:—

"So strong has been the Free-Love tendency, and so numerous and influential media, speakers, and Spiritualists of Free-Love proclivities and *practice*, that we do not know of a single spiritual paper, that has paid expenses, that has not had their assistance, and promulgated their doctrines. *One of the oldest, if not the most influential paper, has several noted Free-Lovers and libertines as special and honored correspondents.*

"Parting husbands and wives is one of the notorious tendencies of Spiritualism. The oldest and most influential teacher of Spiritualism has two wives, each of whom he encouraged to get divorced before he married them. When one of the most eloquent trance speakers left her husband, he came out and stated that he knew sixty cases of media leaving companions. We heard one of the most popular impressional speakers say to a large audience, that she was compelled by spirits to secede from a husband with whom she was living very happily. We lately heard a very intellectual, eloquent and popular normal speaker say, in an eloquent address to a large convention of Spiritualists, that 'he would to God that it had parted twenty, where it had parted one.' In short, wherever we go, we find this tendency in Spiritualism."—*Spiritualism as it is*, pp. 10-11.

Again he says on p. 20:—"After years of careful investigation, we are compelled, *much against our inclinations*, to admit that *more than half* of our traveling media, speakers and prominent Spiritualists, are guilty of immoral and licentious practices, that have justly provoked the abhorrence of all right thinking people."

In view of the foregoing well-attested facts, as given by advanced Spiritualists, who are well informed in



this matter, and speak from actual and extensive observation, we would ask the candid reader if he sees any thing in the *moral* influence of Spiritualism that resembles ancient Christianity? On the other hand, is not its tendency directly the opposite,—only anti-christian? In all its moral bearings, it is in complete harmony with the idea that the spirits who profess to be those of our friends, are only “seducing spirits,” or demons. Their influence is just what we might expect from such a source.

We are personally acquainted with one who claims to be *Christ's* medium, and a medium for the higher order of spirits, as the apostles, and other holy men; and yet we heard a prominent Spiritualist say in Concert Hall, Philadelphia, during the National Convention of Spiritualists, held there in Oct. 1865, that this very medium was “a vile wretch;” and that he held dark circles with persons in their nude state. This same medium has so abused two wives that they cannot live with him. He says he is to have seven wives. In connection with all this, we have rarely found a man who would talk purer morals than this person. After hearing him speak of Jesus and the “Christ principle,” one might suppose him to be a true follower of our Savior; but when the test is applied, the whole is found to be only Satan's counterfeit. Instead of “*Christianism*” being synonymous with “*Spiritualism*,” as claimed by the spirits and Spiritualists, they are as unlike in their moral influence as are Christ and Belial. We might as well affirm that a house of ill-fame was a nursery of virtue, as to say

that Spiritualism exerts a good moral influence upon society. Satan would be glad to make people think so, but facts contradict any such position. Those who have been so far deluded as to be made to believe that Spiritualism was calculated to make men and women virtuous, wiser and happier, find at last they have only been chasing an *ignis-fatuus*,—a snare of Satan to lead them to perdition.



### CHAPTER III.

#### THE DOCTRINES OF SPIRITUALISM.

"Now the Spirit speaketh *expressly* that in the latter times some shall depart from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."—1 TIM. 4: 1.

"As the Scripture cannot be broken" (John 10: 35), the foregoing must be fulfilled "in the latter times," where it is believed we are now living. It is a well-known fact that large numbers of the most noted Spiritualists have once been professors of religion, and members of churches. Many of their lecturers have been preachers of the gospel. Thus it is shown that the Scripture, just quoted, is not broken. If we did not see what we do, then it might be said the Scripture has failed.

If, as we have endeavored to show, Spiritualism is but another name for Demonism, then the *doctrines* taught by the spirits and their followers should be opposed to the Bible, in order to correspond with the rest of their teachings. We will now let the spirits and the Spiritualists tell their own story in their own language. Most of the evidence will be that which has been published in the *Banner of Light*, in Boston, which has been the leading Spiritualist paper for many years. Other Spiritualist papers and books publish

the same. We will arrange their doctrines in the following twelve articles of faith, which we will call

### THE SPIRITS' CREED.

#### 1. *The Bible is not a reliable book.*

In the testimony of a spirit given in the *Banner of Light*, Nov. 23d, 1861, it is said:—

“Many times before we have said that we cannot place implicit confidence in that which we find between the lids of the Bible.”

A spirit, claiming to be Rev. John Moore, says:—“My friend asks, ‘Do you believe the Bible?’ I answer, No, I do not. I cannot believe one word of it as the word of God.”

Another, when speaking of the Bible, says:—“You may not place any confidence in that book.... I can assure my friend that God had no more to do with writing that book than he had;... and do not expect to create any light in the mental world, if you cling to your Bible.”

A spirit, who claims to be Timothy M. Baker, says:—“I’ve got folks in Montpelier, and... I want them to get my sister where I can talk to her straight as I do to you, and I’ll knock her God and Bible all to nothing.”

#### 2. *There is no sin.*

These spirits say:—“We say, as we have said a thousand times before, there is no such thing as sin; no such thing as evil.... Now, then, if there is sin anywhere, God made that sin—he is the author of it.” “The foundation of your religion is fast fading away. Soon we shall find you shaking hands with these new things. This must be so.... Jesus of Nazareth, if he were here to-day, would tell you as we tell you.”

Another spirit, when speaking of sin, says:—“Spiritually and divinely considered, there is no sin. Full



well we know the book you call the Bible teaches of sin. Full well we know the whole christian world recognizes such a condition; but, to us, there is no sin."

Another says:—"All men and women are equally righteous, because all are good. No matter where we find them, or under whatever condition they exist, they are good."

Says another:—"Every thought, word and deed, is of God, and therefore modern Spiritualism is of divine origin. . . . The religion of the heathen is no less divine than is yours. God approved of it as well as yours."

Another spirit says:—"Every thing that ever has been or ever will be is an immutable decree of God. . . . There is not an atom in the universe but will at some time become an immortal spirit. . . . It is vain for man to talk about disobeying the law of God; he can at no time disobey it. . . . Every grain of sand you tread upon to-day shall in time become an immortal soul, endowed with wisdom. . . . You may curse the Author of your being. Do you sin? No; you are but casting off the gross in your nature—obeying your God. . . . The highest archangel was once the lowest spirit on earth."

Says another spirit:—" 'What!' says the self-righteous man, 'is God controlling the murderer when he lifts his hand against his brother?' Yes, we answer, he is, and every atom in nature proves us true."

Another says:—"We believe our God to be the author of sin, as of good. If we give him his due, we give him this."

### 3. *There is no devil.*

The demons appear to be very anxious to have us believe that no such beings exist. This is just as we should expect. A thief would be glad to convince all his neighbors that there were no thieves, so that they would not lock their doors and safes, and then he

could have free access to them. So, if the demons can convince us that there are no such beings, we shall not be on the watch for their snares. The following is their teaching on this point:—

“There is no devil either.... Seems to me as though man must be devoid of good sense to believe any thing of the kind.”

4. *Christ is not raised.*

A spirit says:—“But the question arises, What became of the body of Jesus? We answer, the friends of Jesus stole away the body.... So then we will say the natural body of Jesus Christ was never reanimated after the crucifixion. All nature, our God, tells us so.”

How different the foregoing reads from the Bible on this subject. Says the apostle Paul,—“If Christ be not raised, your faith is vain; ye are yet in your sins. Then they also which are fallen asleep in Christ are perished..... But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept.”—1 Cor. 15: 17, 18, 20. Luke says Jesus “showed himself alive after his passion by many infallible proofs.” Acts 1: 3. Peter said to the Jews: “Ye... killed the Prince of life, whom God hath raised from the dead; whereof we are witnesses.” Acts 3: 15.

5. *Man is his own judge.*

“Within the bosom of every man and woman there is a judgment seat, a throne of God; and before that, and that alone, should men bow down and worship. By that alone they are to be guided. He is to be judged by himself as a spirit; he is to come before no other tribunal. If by the law of self he is condemned, he must suffer according to the condemnation; if acquitted by self, he is indeed acquitted.”



We need not stop to say that this is utterly opposed to the teaching of the Bible. According to this standard, if a man gets mad at his neighbor and kills him, no one must condemn him. Or if the seducer leads hundreds from the path of virtue, to gratify his beastly passions, which have completely seared his conscience about such things, "he is to come before no other tribunal" but "*himself*;" and his decision is, to seduce the next fair one he can find. This is but one item in the "new religion" of Spiritualism, which, it is said, will "exert a moral and reformatory power among the nations, and inaugurate the millennial era."

6. *There is no resurrection of the dead.*

A spirit says:—"We presume our good brother will ask if Jesus did not raise the dead? He never did, and never could." Another says:—"The grave is the resting place of the form we no more require." All the spirits and their followers, so far as we know, deny the resurrection of the dead, which is a cardinal doctrine of the Bible. Says the apostle Paul, "If the dead rise not, then is not Christ raised." Again he says:—"Now if Christ be preached that he rose from the dead, how say some among you that there is no resurrection of the dead?" But if there be no resurrection of the dead, then is Christ not risen."—1 Cor. 15: 12, 13, 16. It will be seen that the apostle was free to admit that christianity was a failure if the *dead* rise not. He says, "If after the manner of men I have fought with the beasts at Ephesus, what advantageth it me, if the *dead* rise not? Let us eat and drink; for to-morrow we die."—1 Cor. 15: 32. Again we

read,—"The Lord himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel, and the trump of God; and the *dead* in Christ shall rise first."

—1 Thess. 4: 16. Says the Savior:—"Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which *all* that are in the *graves* shall hear his voice, and *shall come forth*; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life, and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation."—John 5: 28. 29. No doctrine is more plainly taught in the Bible than that of the resurrection of the *dead*. This the spirits deny.

### 7. *Man is his own Savior.*

"The only true religion is a natural religion.... You are your own Saviors."

In answer to the question, "Did not Christ die, that through his death we might inherit eternal life?" a spirit answers, "No! Christ did not die, that through his death we might live.... His death has no more to do with the remission of sins than the death of any of your martyrs."

Says a spirit, "No man should rely upon any Savior outside of himself.... Each and every one is a Savior, as he is a judge, a God."

The teaching of the spirits on this point is directly the opposite of that in the Bible. When speaking of Jesus, Peter says:—"Neither is there salvation in any other; for there is none other name under heaven given among men whereby we must be saved."—Acts 4: 12.

### 8. *Christ will not come personally.*

Said Leo Miller in a discourse at the Melodeon in Boston, June 2d, 1860, 'We behold in the advent of



Spiritualism the second coming of the Spirit of Jesus of Nazareth."

So far as we can learn, all the spirits deny the *personal* coming of Christ. According to the teaching of the apostle John, this denial is one of the special marks of antichrist. When Jesus ascended, it was said to his disciples,—“Ye men of Galilee, why stand ye gazing up into heaven? this *SAME JESUS which is taken up from you* into heaven, shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.”—Acts 1: 11. No language could more plainly express the *personal* coming of Christ. Says the apostle, “The Lord *HIMSELF* shall descend from heaven.”—1 Thess. 4: 16. Christ came personally the first time, as such he taught in Jerusalem and elsewhere, was crucified, dead and buried, and “rose again the third day according to the Scriptures.”—1 Cor. 15: 4. “This *same Jesus*” is the one who is to come again to raise the dead and set up his kingdom. But all the spirits deny it. Which shall we believe? the Bible, or the spirits?

9. *Man is the Son of God as truly as Christ.*

Gibson Smith, a prominent Spiritualist, and one of the earliest believers, in giving a synopsis of his belief, says:—

“I do not believe that the person who is called Jesus Christ was, or is, ‘God’s only Son.’... He... is no more the Son of God than was John Howard or George Washington.”

A spirit says:—“Christ was a natural man... Christ never performed a miracle during his sojourn on earth.”

Said Mrs. Henderson, a noted Spiritualist, when speaking at the Melodeon in Boston:—

“Jesus... had natural parents... We cannot believe

that there was any thing marvelous either in his birth, his life, or in his death. . . . You claim that there may not be another Christ on earth ; but we see no reason why there may not be myriads of them. . . . Christ never died."

Says a spirit, whose communication was published in the *Banner of Light* :—

"No law of God was ever broken—no law was ever violated." "If Jesus Christ was the Son of the Most High God, so are you, every one of you."

Another says :—"Jesus of Nazareth was a good man, but by no means infallible—no more divine than you are—no more the special child of God than you are."

The foregoing is utterly opposed to the Bible, which teaches that Jesus is "the *only* begotten of the Father" (John 1 : 14), "the *only* begotten Son" (John 1 : 18); "God so loved the world, that he gave his *only* begotten Son, that whosoever believeth on him should not perish, but have everlasting life."—John 3 : 16. All the spirits deny that Jesus was begotten by the Holy Ghost, as the Scriptures teach ; and hence deny that he was the Son of God, making him only the bastard son of Joseph.

Said a lecturer, with whom we are personally acquainted, "I pity you, if you depend on the old, stinking, rotten, miserable body and blood and bones of that Jesus Christ for salvation." Does this sound like christianity ? or, like demonism ?

#### 10. *Man is God.*

In the "Educator," a book of 680 octavo pages, professedly coming from the spirits of some of the most noted men that have lived on the earth,—such as



Daniel Webster, John Quincy Adams, Robert Rantoul, Aristotle, Martin Luther, Socrates, Roger Williams, etc., we find the following:—

“God is man, and man is God... Tell us of God... they might as well say, Tell us of ourselves.” “The being called God exists, organically, in the form of the being called man.”—*Educator*, p. 303.

Says another spirit:—“Every one of you are Gods manifest in the flesh.” “The divine existence is one grand universal man.” “Man is God’s embodiment—his highest, divinest, outer elaboration. God, then, is man, and man is God.”—*Educator*, p. 526.

Another spirit says:—“When man became a living soul, he became a God.” “All living souls are Gods. They die not.” “So, living soul, rejoice in thy wisdom, ... be a King, a God, a Jehovah.” “You are all Gods, every one of you.” “Look within yourself, and behold *yourself a God*, responsible for every act. Read the inscriptions there, and thou shalt learn that thou art *a God in thyself*, and thine own judge.”

A spirit, claiming to be Wm. H. Miller, says:—“God is a spirit; man is a spirit; then the two are one. All men who shall outlive all grossness—who shall have passed beyond all that is mundane and material—go to make up the Godhead, the superior portion of the intellectual world; and the many millions who inhabit the wisdom sphere, may be recognized as the one God.”

### 11. *There is no God.*

The spirits teach that there is “no God” existing as a *person*, but only as a *principle* in all matter, like attraction, electricity, or magnetism. A spirit says:—

“There is no God anywhere to forgive sin.” “There is no such thing as forgiveness for sin.”

A spirit, calling himself Orlando Jenks, says:—  
“If I was coming back to preach, I should say, don’t believe in God.”

“The idea of a God of illimitable capacity is so incomprehensible, that, in our judgment, it borders on the absurd. God, in the abstract, is a *nonentity*—an *ideality* of man’s brain.”—*Spiritual Telegraph*, Jan. 24, 1857.

Another spirit says:—“We must regard him (God) as a central *principle*, but not as a *being*. . . . A principle existing *in matter*, in all conditions, and in all relations, a part of every thing.”

“The Divine is of necessity. . . a vast ocean of magnetism.”—*Educator*, p. 526.

A spirit, claiming to be Joseph Foster, says:—“Ah, there is no God, there can be none. . . . What’s the use of telling them of a God when there is none. . . . I tried to serve God, and there aint any.”

A Free Lovers’ institution has been established by the Spiritualists at Berlin Heights, Ohio, where a paper, called the *Age of Freedom*, has been published, in which we find the following:—

“What a horrible phantom, what a soul-crushing superstition is this idea of an overruling, omnipresent, all-powerful God. . . . Belief in a God is degrading, whatever the character ascribed to him. Where is your God? I can stand up and look him in the face, and affirm that I have a right to ‘life, liberty and happiness,’ whether it is his pleasure that I shall enjoy them or not. It is perfectly plain, then, that his godhood or my manhood must succumb! If I can beat him at even one point, he is no God. But if I can ‘make a case’ once, I can a thousand times, in the case of every single right; and if I maintain my manhood in spite of him, so may every other human being, and so the God is nowhere—utterly routed.”



At the Spiritual Convention, held for the purpose of inquiring into "the cause and cure of evil," Dr. R. T. Hallock said, as reported in the *Spiritual Telegraph*, when speaking of the sentiments of another:—

"Now we may cheerfully sympathize with his mirthful explosion of the *popular* Divinity; no merciful man will object even to his expunging from his vocabulary the three hateful little letters [G-o-d] which express it."

A spirit, who calls himself Thomas Rice, when speaking of some friends, says, "I want to tell those friends that there is no God. I know there is no such gentleman."

What can be more purely the "doctrine of devils," or demons, than the foregoing? Does this sound like the teaching of our dear friends and relatives, who lived in the service of the Lord, and died happy in his love? But it is just what we should expect from demons—the lying and "seducing spirits," who were to do a special work "in the latter times."

12. We now come to their "CARDINAL DOCTRINE," the one which the spirits and their followers claim to be the most important of all; without which their system could not stand. It is the one on which the whole rests—the foundation stone. And is it reasonable to suppose that this one is a Bible doctrine? The apostle says they are "doctrines of devils"; and he does not intimate that their *chief* doctrine is one taught in the Scriptures. We say again, such an idea looks very unreasonable. What is this "cardinal doctrine"? The spirits express it as follows:—

"If man would become satisfied of modern Spiritualism, he must first be satisfied that he is an immortal being."

A spirit says: "The first, the greatest, and the grandest truth, coming through modern Spiritualism, is the immortality of the soul."

Another spirit says:—"I come . . . for the purpose of letting my friend (or relative) know that he has an immortal soul—that's all I wish to establish. When once that is established, this one simple germ of knowledge will work out all the rest."

A demon appears, and professes to be the spirit of Emanuel Swedenborg. He is asked:—

"Is it one of the principal objects of these communications to convince men of the *immortality of the soul*?—Yes. Why are these communications made now more than formerly? Is it because that doctrine is more doubted now?—Yes."

Another spirit, or demon, says: "The visitations and manifestations from the spirit world are to *convince you of the immortality of the soul*."

*Spirits* say, the corner-stone of this new enterprise rests on the following eternal principles:—

"Man is immortal."—*Educator*, p. 133.

"*Human* beings congratulate themselves that they *alone* are immortal."—*Edu.* p. 265.

The primal pair had "the star of individual immortality."—*Edu.* p. 573.

At a convention of Spiritualists, held in Rockford, Ill, in 1857, the following resolution was adopted:—

*Resolved*, That Spiritualism, according to the modern acceptance of that term, embraces *all those who believe in the IMMORTALITY OF THE SOUL*. . . . Beyond this common faith, there is no doctrine or creed necessarily incident to Spiritualism."

It may be asked, why are the demons so anxious to have us believe this doctrine? The reason is obvious.



Their leader taught our first parents, in their paradise home, that they should *not die*, which was contradicting what the Lord had said. The statements stand thus:—“*Thou shalt surely die.*”—Gen. 2: 17. “*Ye shall not surely die.*”—Gen. 3: 4. Which told the truth? If Adam is still alive, and is immortal, then it follows that the deceiver has the truth on his side; but if Adam died, then Satan is proved a liar from the beginning, as the Scriptures affirm. We read that Adam was “sent . . . forth from the garden of Eden,” “lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever.”—Gen. 3: 22, 23. Here we see the mercy of God in not allowing Adam to become immortal, and thus perpetuate sin and misery eternally. We read again,—“All the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years, and *he died.*”—Gen. 5: 5. No language could teach more clearly that Adam was *mortal*. Again we read,—“Shall *mortal man* be more just than God?”—Job. 4: 17. As man is now mortal, how can he get immortality? The apostle gives a very plain answer to this question. When speaking of what God will do, he says:—“Who will render to every man according to his deeds: to them who, by *patient continuance in well doing, seek* for glory and honor and *immortality*, eternal life.”—Rom. 2: 6-7. Here we learn that the condition by which we may gain immortality is “patient continuance in well doing.” Should we be exhorted to “*seek* for . . . immortality,” if we were already immortal, as the demons teach? Such an idea seems absurd. Now if the demons can

make us believe that man does not die, then of course the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead is false; for man cannot be raised from the dead, if he never dies. But if the demons can persuade us that they are the spirits of our friends, who once lived on earth, then they can easily accomplish the rest of their work of deception; hence their "*Cardinal doctrine*," on which their whole system rests, is a belief in the immortality of the soul. Take this away, and their infernal work is at once exposed; also hero-worship, Catholicism, with its prayers to saints, and its purgatory; Swedenborgianism, Mohammedanism and Shakerism, must all go down with Spiritualism; for they all rest on the same doctrine of the immortality of the soul, which we find no where taught in the Bible.

We close this part of the subject by an extract from "*Spiritualism as it is*," by Dr. Wm. B. Potter, who has had much experience in Spiritualism. When speaking of the contradictory teachings of the spirits, he says:—

"The teachings and theories given through the different manifestations, are as various as it is possible to conceive. Indeed, few of the most devoted 'seekers after truth under difficulties' are aware of the endless contradictions and absurdities that are mixed up with the most exalted truths and the most profound philosophies. We have room for only a tithe of them, for we have not yet found the first question or subject about which they do not contradict each other. . . . .

"We are taught that God is a person; that he is impersonal; that he is omnipotent; that he is governed by nature's laws; that everything is God; there is no God; that we are gods. We are taught that



the soul is eternal; that it commences its existence at conception, at birth, at maturity, at old age. That all are immortal, that some are immortal, that none are immortal. That the soul is a winged monad in the centre of the brain, that it gets tired, and goes down into the stomach to rest; that it is material, that it is immaterial; that it is unchangeable; that it changes like the body, that it dies with the body, that it develops the body, that it is developed by the body, that it is human in form, that it is in but one place at a time, that it is in all places at the same time.

“We are taught that the spirit world is on earth—just above the air—beyond the milky way. That it has but one sphere, three spheres, six spheres, seven spheres, thirty-six spheres, an infinite number of spheres. That it is a real, tangible world, that it is all a creation of the mind of the beholder, and appears different to different spirits. That it is inhabited by animals, birds, etc., that they do not inhabit it. That it is a sea of ether, that it is a plain, that it has mountains, lakes and valleys, that it is a belt around the earth. We are taught that spirits eat food—live by absorption, live on magnetism, thoughts, love. That they control media by will power, by magnetism, by entering media, by standing by their side, by an influence beyond our atmosphere, by permission of the Lord.

“That spirits converse by thought reading, by oral language. That their music is harmony of soul—that it is instrumental and vocal. That they live single; in groups of nine. That they marry without having offspring; that they have offspring by mortals; that they have offspring by each other. That their marriage is temporary; that it is eternal. That spirits never live again in the flesh; that they do return, and enter infant bodies, and live many lives in the flesh. That some are born first in the spheres, and afterwards are born on earth in the flesh. That the true affinity is born in the spirit world at the same time that the

counterpart is born on earth. That all spirits are good; that some are bad; that all progress, that some progress; that none progress. . . .

“That there is no high, no low, no good, no bad. That murder is right, lying is right, slavery is right, adultery is right. That whatever is, is right. That nothing we can know, can injure the soul, or retard its progress. That it is wrong to blame any; that none should be punished; that man is a machine, and not to blame for his conduct. . . .

“That the spirit of the tree exists in perfect form after the tree is burnt. That monads are God’s thoughts and go through all forms of rocks, trees, animals, and at last become men. That we see by a positive radiation, that goes out from the eyes, and touches things. That thoughts are living entities, and may flow down the arm, on to the paper; if that is burnt, they float around. That spirit is substance, in absolute condensation; that matter is substance, whose particles never touch. That sexual union is necessary to health and development, that it is a great help to media to get spiritual elements; but, if the parties are not adapted, it is a great injury and an awful wrong. That as people develop they become unadapted, and poison each other. That affinities will be perfectly satisfied with each other. That to live together without perfect love, is worse than prostitution. That all earthly marriage is of the flesh, and must end; and, that the true affinity is a spirit mate, born at the same time in spirit life that the counterpart is born on earth.

“N. B.—*All the above teachings we have heard given by media, or from communications.*”

It will be seen from the foregoing, that the demons vary their teaching according to the belief of those whom they would seduce. They do not tell the christian, when he first consults them, that “there is no



God;" because they know full well that he would reject their testimony; but as soon as they think there is a chance for success, they endeavor to raise doubts in his mind about the truth of the Bible, and thus lead him on from one step in infidelity to another, till he becomes a bold scoffer against the holy doctrine of the scriptures.

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE POLITICS OF SPIRITUALISM.

The political aspect of Spiritualism is an important item. It is very evident that for some years the demons have been laying plans to control the governments of this world through the agency of their mediums. For this reason, they have taken special pains to get the leading men in the world to embrace Spiritualism; and their success has been wonderful. Many of the prominent men in the American government are Spiritualists, including generals in the army, members of Congress, and other leading men; Napoleon III. is a Spiritualist, and it is said that other crowned heads are consulting the spirits, as well as many noted men who occupy very high positions in political circles. Col. John O'Mahony, the President of the Fenians, is also a Spiritualist.

We will now listen to the spirits and their followers, and hear what they have to say about political matters.

A few years since, the following editorial article appeared in the *Spiritual Age*, edited by Mr. A. E. Newton, of Boston, now Superintendent of the Freedmen's schools in the District of Columbia:—

“There is a wide-spread and universal belief among all classes and all religious sects, at the present day, that some wonderful developments are soon to be manifested to the world, which shall materially revolutionize the existing phases of Church, Society, and State.”



When speaking of the doctrines of Spiritualism, the editor goes on to say :—

“We tell you, Spiritualists, that upon the base of the doctrines there put forth, you shall yet see reared the grandest political structures the world ever saw.”

In an article headed, “The Angel Movement,” we find the following announcement :—

“New phase in Spiritualism! Great national symbolic outwrought spiritual manifestation! All sects and denominations, creeds, parties, nations, kindreds, tongues, and peoples, now existing on the face of the earth, to be dissolved and pass away, and a new, divine, governmental order to arise instead. The judgment day, millennial morn, and resurrection of the dead at hand.”

In a communication on the “Mission of Spiritualism,” the writer says :—

“It remains for us to apply the principles of a Rational Spiritualism to the practical reformation of the world. . . . The race has been doomed to bear a thousand crosses to the scenes of its mournful crucifixion. Spiritualism comes at last to deliver humanity from the bondage of this death. Let the quickened spiritual nature, freed from its long incarceration in the dungeons of ignorance, sensuality, superstition and crime, *assume the government* of the world, that we may be saved from the corruptions of flesh and sense.”

“Spiritualism comes to lay—broad and deep on the eternal principles of Nature and the Soul—the foundations of new institutions, and to preside at the inauguration of the Divine Order and the Celestial Life on earth.”

The following was published in the *Spiritual Age* :—

“We all believe that the real, underlying ideas foreshadowed by what is popularly called ‘Spiritual-

ism,' look forward to the political, material regeneration of society, as well as to a Spiritual revolution, and it is high time that some public, formal action, looking in this direction, were taken. . . . Let us assume a political attitude, and make the world feel that we are no longer to be trampled on with impunity."

"In speaking of the new government, the writer denominates it,—‘A political institution, such as the world has never yet seen, and of which now it has not the remotest idea.’ He says, when we come under the approaching new government, ‘There is no more voting for Presidents, Congressmen and Municipal officers.’"

In defining the purpose of Spiritualism, a spirit says:—

"The first great object is to convince skeptics of the immortality of the soul, disrobe death of its terrors, give to men a rational religion, and unite all men in one grand, sublime faith, in which angels, or spirits of the dead, hold intercourse with living men; thus raising the condition of the material world up to that of, and in harmony with, the spiritual."

"The design is, through this increase of knowledge and spiritual elevation, to crush, destroy, and break in pieces, all the existing forms of government on the face of the whole earth, . . . and in place of them build up one common form of government in all the earth, having one common head." "In this form of government, which will be a Thocratic Democracy, every man will be *his own ruler*, and his *natural demands* his HIGHEST LAW."

The first movement towards forming a new government, which came to our knowledge, was at the convention of Spiritualists held in Boston, March 10th, 1857, one object of which, as expressed in their call for the conference, was, "To consider the wisdom of taking incipient steps toward forming a *new confed-*



eration, wherein distinctions of clime, of color, and of sex, will be no bar to equality.”

In the *Spiritual Telegraph* of June 20, 1857, we have an account of a similar convention held in the city of New York. The report says, their “object is to *overturn* the inharmonies and evils of the present condition, and in their place to establish ‘*a new social order on the earth.*’”

This “new social order” is more fully set forth in the *Telegraph* of June 13, 1857, under the head of “Practical Spiritualism, Purposes and Plans.” The writer says : —

“For the last four or five years, a movement has been going forward, comparatively unobserved by the public at large, whose central *purpose* is no less than the *entire regeneration . . . . of the whole human race. . . .* It is hardly to be supposed that an enterprise so startling to the world as the last eight years have proved the spiritual movement to be, would have for its *grand end* anything like the presentation of mere phenomenal exhibitions, abstract philosophies, the incidental re-union and gratification of long-severed and lacerated affections, or even the generation of a new, a broader, and more living conviction of the truth of immortality. All these, indeed, and more in the same line, have been, and still are, very useful, and are not in the least to be undervalued; but if the movement itself *rested* in them as an end, it would seem that the end itself was quite unworthy of such a grand commencement, such a wide-spread interest, and such hopes and aspirations as have already been created.”

“*The great purpose* of the spirit world, then, is of a much broader nature, and a more thoroughly practical spirit. . . . It aims, in short, at the establishment of **A NEW SOCIAL ORDER on the earth, through whose**

mediatorial harmony *alone* the divine truth and its good can descend *only* upon and into a waiting and responsive race. . . . .

“It is also the purpose of Spiritualism to so *educate* a class of persons in certain practical functions, that they shall become *pivots of groups* in the coming new social order. . . . . About two hundred and fifty persons have already been *selected*. . . . These persons are scattered all over the United States and the provinces. . . . .

“Another purpose of the movement is the establishment of a *new system* of GOVERNMENT. It is a *combination* of the two elements of MONARCHY and REPUBLICANISM, making, therefore, (partly because of the combination, and partly for other reasons) a *new idea in government*. It has already matured its plans to quite an extent. . . . .

“All these things grow out of a NEW CHURCH—a church of principles—not of dogmas. This church is to be both interior and exterior, or individual and organic. It is to reconcile both the *Catholic* and the *Protestant* phases of the religious idea, not overlooking the *three great religions* [See Rev. 16: 13], which dogmatic Christianity does not recognize, viz., Hindooism, Mohammedanism, and Judaism. It is the *grand unitizing church* of the spiritual age, and blends into harmony the antagonized elements of the analytic ages. It is the *mother* of all institutions for external uses—therefore, the *mother* of the States, and in the *combination* takes place the “UNION OF CHURCH AND STATE.”

All this might well be called an “image” of the Leopard beast, as it represents a union of Church and State on a grand scale.

In the foregoing, it is stated that “about two hundred and fifty persons have already [in 1857] been selected,” who “shall become *pivots of groups* in the coming new



social order." These pivot men are as commanding officers in an army, when the time comes for action. They are to direct the movements in their division, in harmony with the general plan. The following, from the *Educator*, gives the manner of selecting the pivot men:—

“QUESTIONS FOR THE LEADERS IN THE NEW  
GOVERNMENT.

1. Do you understand that it requires two persons, male and female, to constitute a whole man?

2. Do you understand that each man, and each woman, if you please, has a perfect right, under all circumstances, in all conditions, and in whatever locality, to do as he or she pleases?

3. Do you know that government is but a temporary arrangement to be outgrown with the greatest possible speed”? To be answered “without the least equivocation, without the slightest qualification.”

II.

“Is the person ready now to aid in constructing a government on these fundamental principles?... Are you willing to risk your reputation, your property, your life, if need be, in the new enterprise?”

If he cannot answer “without hesitation, he is not the man for the times.”

III.

“Do you love these fundamental principles... more than all things else?... Are you willing to announce your allegiance to these fundamental principles, even though it may separate you from church, from state, from home, from land, from children, from the companion of your bosom? If the person questioned hesitates, then he is unfit for this struggle; he ought not to be engaged; for when the storm comes... this man will be missing.”—*Educator*, pp. 412, 413.

*The coming storm*

"When . . . the people are ripe for action, let the decisive blow be struck . . . The next political revolution . . . will be the grandest the world has ever witnessed."—*Educator*, pp. 434-5.

The foregoing needs no comment. Rome never bound her votaries with a firmer oath to carry out her principles, than the spirits are now binding their leaders in this new political movement.

The spirits say, "The hour is at hand when a revolution must come. . . . It will be a fearful crisis—an hour when the passions of men will be excited to an extent seldom, if ever, known before. This Association proposes to place in the hands of its general agent a series of instructions which will be of the greatest use in that hour of peril."—*Educator*, p. 403. "Prominent persons will be placed at the helm of the new ship of state, whose motto shall be, 'ETERNAL PRINCIPLES, NOT PARTIES.'"

Already the talk has begun about "PRINCIPLES." What are these principles? The answer is found in the *Educator*, on pp. 136, 412, 526. It says:—

"The corner-stone of this *new enterprise rests* on the following eternal principles:—

1. *Man is immortal.*
2. It requires two persons, male and female, to constitute a whole man.
3. Each man, and each woman, if you please, has a perfect right, under *all* circumstances, in *all* conditions, and in whatever locations, to do as he or she pleases.
4. Government is but a temporary arrangement, to be outgrown with the greatest possible speed.
5. The highest possible human government is *interior*, and may at *all* times, in *all* places, and under *all* possible circumstances, be safely obeyed.



6. God... is man, and man is God.... No clearer idea of the divine existence can possibly be communicated to mind, than in the statement that he is *One Grand Universal Man.*"

All of these principles are not set forth at first to every Spiritualist, but are taught as soon as it is thought they can bear them. The *leading* doctrine is the immortality of the soul. We learn from the spirits that an association has been formed among them, called "THE ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENTIZERS," said to be composed of the spirits of Robert Rantoul, Daniel Webster, John Quincy Adams, Martin Luther, Roger Williams, and Socrates, for the purpose of devising plans to reorganize the governments of the world, and establish them on an entire new basis. This "new basis" is fully given in the *Educator*, and corresponds with the movements now going on among Spiritualists; yet these instructions were given some seven or eight years since, when there was no sign that Spiritualism would become a political power. Now there is left no room for a doubt, when the facts are known.

The following extract is from "The Soldier's Tract," published July 4th, 1861. It has been circulated among the soldiers, and is said to have been received by them with much interest, and preserved in preference to all others:—

"A spiritual prophecy, foreshowing the termination and final result as purposed by the Divine Spirit, to be effected by this *strange* American war." "Delivered in trance, by Mr. L. J. Pardee, at Allston Hall, Boston, on Sunday afternoon, May 26th, 1861." "We hold that this administration has a mission to perform, though it is perhaps the last administration elected under the

present constitution. . . . Any man who believes that this grand [Spiritual] philosophy comes to do a little work and then die away, to stir the church up a little, and not to walk into the government to cleanse the Augean stables there with its fire-blood of divine light, . . . does not apprehend that this truly is the day of judgment. . . . You must be prepared for such times as you never yet dreamed of. . . . The higher life will control the secret springs which guide the nation. . . . This is not merely a political revolution; it is a spiritual revolution, reaching the heart of hearts of things in state, church, and society. First, indeed, the power of Spiritualism was felt in the church, somewhat; then, in the sphere of politics; now it has got to go back again into the church, and stir up a deeper religious sense of the wants and defects of the people. . . .

“The next government which shall arise over this people, and which is even now drawing nigh from out the angel world, will be a Theocratic Democracy — God ruling through mediumistic man. . . . And then, as Spiritualism and Celestialism march over the land, the master souls, once denizens of time, will influence men’s acts; the spiritual congress above will guide in all wisdom and truth the councils assembled here below.”

At a late picnic of the Spiritualists, held in Abington, Mass., Dr. A. B. Child, a prominent and intelligent Spiritualist, made a speech which was published in the *Banner of Light*, Aug. 5th 1865. In the course of the Doctor’s remarks, he is reported to have spoken as follows:—

“The time is speedily coming when every one who has opposed, scorned, reviled and persecuted spiritual communion will be brought to the altar of sacrifice; will suffer sorrow, regret, affliction. . . . It will be a bitter cup, but a necessary remedy for the present



sickly morals and religions of men. It is in the power of the spiritual world to make any poor man rich in one day—to make any rich man poor in one day—to make a well man sick in a moment of time, or to make a sick man well—to take life, or to continue it—to make woe in the human heart, or joy and gladness there. . . .

Imminent and immediate dangers to earthly prosperity hang over all opposition to spiritual communion. Mark well, and you will soon see that the destruction of property, of health, even physical life, will follow close upon the heels and overtake all the obstinate, persistent warriors against sin and the devil—all the military of the church militant—all who revile and scoff, and say all manner of things falsely against Spiritualism—against sins, sects, creeds, beliefs not their own. Disasters on sea and land, fires, failures, accidents, diseases, and early deaths, will fall thick and fast and heavy, to harrow the peace and happiness of every bosom that is persistently turned with opposition and bitterness against this holy influx that comes down from heaven to earth to tell us the uses of sin and sorrow; to tell us of the realities of the world from whence man gets all his blessings; to tell him of the world from whence he came and whither he is going. . . .

Ay, more than blessed are ye, for a new era is beginning; a new religion is coming; a new day of morals is dawning; a new road for human progress is making; it is the road that the toiling hands of Spiritualism have graded, over lowlands and through highlands, over the swamps of humility and the mountains of pride. It is a straight road; it is a level road; it is a grand highway for all humanity; it is onward forever. Then take courage and be comforted; be not weary, for the work of Spiritualism is the work of well-doing. Relax no effort—seek to change no purpose in this great design, for it *must* make a revolution in the morals and religions

of men that shall be a signal epoch in the history of the world's future, for the world's happiness."

We think the foregoing quite in harmony with the wishes and purposes of Satan.

In conclusion, we would say, that we have endeavored to lay before the reader, in a brief manner, the true origin of Spiritualism; also its morals, doctrines and politics, as taught by the leading spirits and Spiritualists. We think all must see the harmony of parts in this system, when it is admitted to be the work of demons. It is in perfect keeping with their character as "*seducing spirits*." From the foregoing, it is very evident that they purpose to control the governments of the world. Imagine the state of things, when demons have established their religion with its morals, doctrines, politics, and "new social order," as proposed; when "each man, and each woman" shall have "a perfect right, under *all* circumstances, in *all* conditions, and in whatever location, to do as he or she pleases."

In this "ancient christianity"? We think no system of religion can be further removed from it. It utterly repudiates the whole plan of salvation as taught in the Bible by Jesus and his apostles. It *denies* that Jesus was begotten by the Holy Spirit; that he was the Son of God as taught in the Scriptures; that his death had any more to do with our salvation than that of any martyr; that he was raised from the dead; that he will ever come again to this planet personally; or that he forgives sin. It also denies the existence of God, except as a "*principle*" in all matter; that the God of the Bible created the earth, or man; that "he hath appointed a day in the which he will judge



the world in righteousness"; it teaches that there is "no sin"; that all will be saved; and yet it has not led one to the Savior, but many thousands away from him, with fair promises of something better; just as the wily seducer leads the innocent from a happy home to the dens of iniquity, and final ruin.

Is it not the duty of those who see and know these things to sound the alarm? If he who sees the blind man about to step off a precipice is guilty when he refuses to tell him of his danger; how much more so is he who remains silent when he sees his fellow beings about to take a road that leads to eternal destruction. How can the Lord say, "Well done, good and faithful servant," to him who has looked on quietly, while men and women have been seduced away from the road to life, by those whom he knows to be demons transformed into angels of light?

Such considerations as these have urged us to say what we have on this subject. We have none but kind feelings towards all who have been so unfortunate as to be seduced by the demons. We have spoken plainly because we feel friendly. We do not wish to wound the feelings of one who believes in Spiritualism; but we do wish to expose the wicked spirits who are laying plans to ruin our race if possible.

We have hardly begun to open the deep iniquity of this demoniacal system. But we hope these few words, by the blessing of God, may be the means of assisting the reader to arm himself against this awful delusion; causing him to cling closer to Jesus and the Bible, and be ready for the coming kingdom.

Your Brother in Christ,      MILES GRANT.

"a world in righteousness"; it teaches that there is "no sin"; that all will be saved; and yet it has not led one to the Savior, but many thousands away from him, with fair promises of something better; just as the evil seducer leads the innocent from a happy home to the doors of infamy, and final ruin.

Is it not the duty of those who see and know these things to sound the alarm? If he who sees the blind man about to step off a precipice is guilty when he refuses to tell him of his danger; how much more so is he who remains silent when he sees his fellow beings about to take a road that leads to eternal destruction. How can the Lord say, "Well done, good and faithful servant," to him who has looked on quietly, while men and women have been seduced away from the road to life, by those whom he knows to be demons transformed into angels of light?

Such considerations as these have urged us to say what we have on this subject. We have done but kind feelings towards all who have been so unfortunate as to be seduced by the demons. We have spoken plainly because we feel friendly. We do not wish to wound the feelings of one who believes in Spiritualism; but we do wish to expose the wicked spirits who are laying plans to ruin our race if possible.

We have hardly begun to open the deep indignity of this demoniacal system. But we hope these few words, by the blessing of God, may be the means of assisting the reader to arm himself against this awful delusion; causing him to cling closer to Jesus and the Bible, and be ready for the coming kingdom.

Your Brother in Christ,   
 MILES CRANT.



# THE SOUL.

## WHAT IS IT?

“Man became a living soul.”—GENESIS 2: 7.

Volumes have been written on the SOUL, and still many persons seem to be in great darkness on the subject. We think much of the difficulty has arisen on account of not adhering strictly to the Scriptures for light, instead of the speculations of philosophy. TRUE philosophy and the Bible are ever in harmony; but the fables of men, now so common, have nearly eclipsed the truth of the Lord, and left the mass to grope their way in the labyrinths of error, like blind men wandering alone in search for diamonds. They seem to scorn the Bible, the true source of light and truth, and hasten in the opposite direction, hoping for relief. As well might a man in the dark caverns of earth urge his way further down amid its blackness of darkness hoping to find light, as for one to look for light and truth among the musty tomes of old philosophers. Says Paul, “Beware, lest any man spoil you through philosophy.” How many might have been saved from ruin, had they observed the instruction of the apostle. People wish to be wise “above that which is written.” Let us go to the word of the Lord for truth and abide by that, if it spoils all our creeds.

Before commencing the examination of the subject, we wish to say that soul and spirit are not one and the same thing, as used in the Bible. The word *ruach*, rendered spirit in Eccl. 12: 7,—“Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was, and the *spirit* shall return unto God who gave it,”—is found four hundred times in the Hebrew text, but is not *once* rendered soul. *Pneuma*, the corresponding Greek word, is found three hundred and eighty-five times in the New Testament, and is not *once* rendered soul. Hence our readers will understand that when we are speaking of the *soul*, we do not mean *spirit*.

## WHAT IS THE SOUL ?

This question is often asked, but answers vary, thus showing that all do not think alike.

Popular writers tell us the soul is "an independent thing," "the real entity," and exists as such, whether the mechanism " (the body) "through which and upon which it acts, be disarranged or not; and even the destruction of the latter " (the body) "does not affect the former," (the soul.) "It is this spiritual organism which sees and hears and feels, which suffers and enjoys, which thinks and wills and executes; which is, in short, *the real man*. As perfect a picture may be formed upon the retina of the eye after death as before; as complete a vibration produced upon the drum of the ear; but no thing is seen or heard, because *the man has gone*, and these instruments are of no further service." [*Discourse on the immortality of man by Thomas M. Clark, D. D.*, pp. 6-7.

Another modern writer on popular theology says,

"The *soul*, (*the real man*)" lives in the body just as a man lives in a house. When the house is carried away by a flood, or burned up, or it becomes old and falls to pieces, or anything else happens so that the *man* cannot live in it any longer, he chooses a house somewhere else and goes to live in that. So your *soul* must move away at some time and leave the body?"

Another:—"The Creator has given us these bodies to be our habitation—a dwelling adapted to our highest comfort and welfare. Our individual identity does not consist in the body. The body is not the man. The man is really an invisible being; and the body is the house in which he lives. The eye is no part of the man; it is only the window of the house through which he looks out upon the world. The ear is no part of the man, it is only the earthly medium through which sound is conveyed to the dweller within. When the house decays he will live elsewhere."—[*Phil. of Health*, by L. B. Coles, p. 213.

We wish our readers to have the foregoing popular description of the soul in their minds, when we come to the examination of the Bible testimony, and remember that we never *command* or *punish* the *house*, but the *tenant* who dwells there; consequently, all the instruction, promises and threatenings are addressed to the soul—"the real man," and not the body, or house, in which he lives. A man's house can have no moral character. Whatever, then, we find in the Bible addressed to *man* can have no reference to his house, or body, if the popular view is correct.

## NEPHESH—SOUL.

We now come to consider the word *nephesh*, which is the only one rendered soul in the Old Testament, with two exceptions, which



are found in Isa. 57: 16 and Job 30: 15. The first reads "For I will not contend forever, neither will I be always wroth for the spirit (*ruach*) should fail before me, and the souls which I have made." The word here rendered *souls*, is *n'shahmah*, which is never used in the Bible to represent a conscious existence separate from the human organism, but is generally rendered breath. The same word occurs in Isa. 2: 22. "Cease ye from man, whose *breath* (*n'shahmah*) is in his *nostrils*." No one supposes that a man's *soul* is in his *nostrils*, but we know that the breath of life is there; consequently nothing can be drawn from Isa. 57: 16 in favor of the existence of man separate from his physical organism.

Job 30: 15 reads, "Terrors are turned upon me; they pursue my soul as the wind; and my welfare passeth away as a cloud." The word rendered soul is *n'deevah*, which means "liberality," "excellence," and would be more properly translated,—they pursue my liberality as the wind. Nothing here to favor the idea that the soul is "the real man" aside from the body.

In considering *nephesh*, the word rendered soul in all other places in the Old Testament, we should remark that Hebrew nouns are derived from Hebrew verbs, and *nephesh* is from a verb which signifies "to breathe," "to respire." Roy, in his lexicon, renders *nephesh* as follows:—"the soul," "life," "vital part," "a man," "a creature," "affection," "person," "substance."—This word is found in the *Hebrew text* seven hundred and fifty two times; and is rendered soul four hundred and seventy-five times. Can it be possible that an important word is used so many times in the Scriptures, without a definite and plain signification? We think not.

Parkhurst, a distinguished Hebrew lexicographer, says,—

"As a noun, *nephesh* hath been supposed to signify the spiritual part of man, or what we commonly call his soul; I must for myself confess that I can find *no passage* where it hath *undoubtedly* this meaning."

*What is the Soul?* "What saith the Scripture?" The Bible must decide the question. The word *nephesh*, is *first* found in Gen. 1: 20, and applied to *beasts*. "And God said, Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature that hath life," margin, "living soul;" Heb. *nephesh chaiyah*, soul living, or living soul as it is arranged in English. The *second* time the word occurs is in the 21st verse. "And God created great whales,

and every living creature, (*nephesh chaiyah*, living soul,) that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly." We see, from these scriptures, that all the animals of the *sea* are living souls. The *third* time the word *nephesh* occurs, is in Gen. 1: 24. "And God said, let the *earth* bring forth the living creature, (*nephesh chaiyah*, living soul,) after his kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beast of the earth, after his kind." From this passage, we learn that all the animals upon the *earth* are living souls.

Dr. Clark says, when commenting on this verse, "*nephesh chaiyah*" is "a general term to express *all* creatures endued with animal life, in *any* of its infinitely varied gradations." *Nephesh* next occurs in Gen. 1: 30. "And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is *life*, (*nephesh chaiyah*, margin, living soul,) I have given every green herb for meat."

We have now found *nephesh*, the word rendered soul, is applied to beasts, and all living animals, in the first four instances where it is used in the Bible. This point should not be forgotten. We cannot dispute but that it is correctly used when thus applied. He who formed the animals knew best what to call them, and made no mistake when he named each a *nephesh chaiyah*, or living soul.

McCulloch says, in his able work on the "Credibility of the Scriptures," "There is no word in the Hebrew language that signifies either soul or spirit, in the technical sense in which we use the terms, as implying something distinct from the body."—Cred. of Scrip., Vol. 2, p. 471.

The *fifth* use of *nephesh* is in Gen. 2: 7, which is its *first* application to *man*. "And the Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a living soul," (*nephesh chaiyah*.) Here we have precisely the same words applied to man that we have found in the four passages already examined. Does *nephesh chaiyah* mean any more in Gen. 2: 7, than in 1: 20, 21, 24 and 30? If so, by what rule of exegesis? It is very evident that *nephesh*, in all the passages we have examined, represents the *whole being*, and not an immortal, spiritual existence, separate from the physical organism.



Kitto, in his "Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature," renders Gen. 2: 7, as follows: "And Jehovah God formed the man [Heb. the Adam] dust from the ground, and blew into his nostrils the breath of life; and *the man* became a *living animal*."

Was this the beginning of man? If so, Plato and other heathen philosophers are wrong. Kitto remarks of Gen. 2: 7, "We should be acting unfaithfully, if we were to affirm" that "an immortal spirit" is "*contained or implied* in this passage."—Cyc. Bib. Lit., Vol. 1, p. 59.

Bishop Tillotson says, "The immortality of the soul is rather *supposed*, or taken for *granted*, than expressly revealed in the Bible." This is a frank admission, but such an one, we think as every unbiased individual must make, after a thorough examination of the subject. Shall we found our faith upon a *supposition*, and one, too, which will lay a strong foundation for the support of the purgatory of the Catholics, their prayers to saints, Swedenborgianism, Shakerism, Spiritualism, and the doctrine of eternal misery; when, if the *supposition* be rejected, all these monstrous systems of error fall to the ground?

In continuing our examination, we will turn to Ex. 12: 16, 19

"And in the first day there shall be a holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be a holy convocation to you; no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every *man* (*nephesh*, margin, soul,) must eat. ....Seven days shall there be no leaven found in your houses; for whosoever eateth that which is leavened, even that *soul* (*nephesh*) shall be cut off."

It will be seen from these passages that *man* and *soul* are translated from the same original word, and represent the same being. The man eats and the *soul* *eats*. We think it plain to every candid reader that the word *nephesh* in these texts represents the whole accountable being, called man or soul. Parallel with the foregoing, we read in Lev. 7: 25 and 17: 15, that, "Whosoever eateth the fat of the beast, of which men offer an offering made by fire unto the Lord, even the *soul* (*nephesh*) that *eateth* it shall be cut off from his people. ....And every *soul* (*nephesh*) that *eateth* that which died of itself," &c. Can we suppose for one moment that the man or *soul* (*nephesh*) which is capable of eating animals, is some indescribable, "immaterial," "uncompounded," "indivisible," "indestructible," "intangible" "*essence*," that 'lives in the body just as a man lives in a house?' In Gen. 2:

16, we read, "And the Lord God commanded *the man*, saying of every tree of the garden *thou* mayest freely *eat*." It will be noticed that the pronoun *thou* stands for the noun *man*, and cannot properly be made to represent any more or less. But "*the Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground*;" and says to *him* after *he* had eaten the forbidden fruit, "In the sweat of thy face shalt *thou eat* bread, till *thou* return unto the *ground*; for out of it wast *thou* taken; for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return."—Gen 3: 19. He could not *return* to the theological hell, for he had never been there. But when we let the Lord mean as he says, how plain is the verse last quoted; indeed, we do not see how it could be made more so. But if the Lord intended to teach us that when a man dies he is still alive, he has a very blind and strange way of expressing it. If *men* should talk so, we would say they meant to deceive us. Where is Adam *now*? If he has not *died* and *returned* to the *ground*, but is *alive*, then the Lord has broken his word, and Satan is cleared from the charge of being "a liar," when he said, in Gen. 3: 4, "Ye shall not surely *die*." If man does not die, he needs no resurrection.

Says Wm. Tyndale\* in answer to Thomas More, the Platonist,

"And ye, in putting them [souls] in heaven, hell, and purgatory, *destroy* the arguments wherewith Christ and Paul prove the resurrection....If the souls be in heaven, tell me why they be not in as good case as the angels be? And then what cause is there of the resurrection?"

Tyndale's is a very reasonable question, but a hard one for popular theologians to answer.

Let us look, now, at a few more examples of the use of *nephesh*. Numb: 35: 11. "Then ye shall appoint you cities to be cities of refuge for you; that the slayer may flee thither, which *killeth any person (nephesh)* at unawares." From this passage, we learn that a *nephesh*, soul or person, may be killed. Hence, we read in Joshua 10: 28, "And that day Joshua took Makkedah, and smote it with the edge of the sword, and the king thereof he utterly destroyed, them and all the *souls (nephesh)* that were therein."

Jer. 52: 29. "In the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar he carried away captive from Jerusalem eight hundred and thirty

---

\* [The author of the first printed edition of the Bible in English.]



and two persons, (*nephesh*, margin souls.) Peter says, "eight souls were saved by water," at the time of the flood. When the Revelator was giving an account of the vials, in which "is filled up the wrath of God," he says in Rev. 16: 3, "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and every living soul died in the sea."

Without quoting further examples, we think it will be plain to all, that the primary use of *nephesh* (Hebrew) and *psuche* (Greek) indicates the whole man, or animal; is equally applicable to both, and represents the entire organism, which dies when "the breath of life" is taken away; then the man—the soul or person—returns to "dust," to await the resurrection at the last day."

In speaking of Eccl. 9: 10, where it is said, "There is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wisdom, in the grave whither thou goest;" Luther says,—

"Another proof that the dead are insensible Solomon thinks, therefore, that the dead are altogether asleep, and think of nothing. They lie, not reckoning days or years, but when awakened, will seem to themselves to have slept scarcely a moment." [Debt and Grace, page 258.]

We now advance to examine the sixth text, which is in Gen. 2: 19.

"And out of the ground the Lord God formed every beast of the field, and every fowl of the air, and brought them unto Adam to see what he would call them; and whatsoever Adam called every living creature, (*nephesh chaiyah*) that was the name thereof."

In this passage we have *nephesh* again applied to beasts, and used in its primary sense, representing the whole being. The same remark applies to Lev. 11: 10, 46.

"And all that have not fins and scales in the seas, and in the rivers, of all that move in the waters, and of every living thing, (*nephesh chaiyah*) which is in the waters."

"This is the law of beasts and the fowl, and of every living creature (*nephesh chaiyah*, living soul) that moveth in the waters, and of every creature (*nephesh*) that creepeth upon the earth."

We do not see how it can be made any plainer, that it is equally correct to call beasts souls, and living souls, as it is men, and that the primary meaning of *nephesh*—soul—includes the whole being.

The seventh text in order containing *nephesh*, is found in Gen.

9: 4. "But flesh with the *life* (*nephesh*) thereof, which is the *blood* thereof, shall ye not eat." The next verse contains two more similar examples. "And surely your blood of your *lives* (*nephesh*) will I require; at the hand of every beast will I require it, and at the hand of man; at the hand of every man's brother will I require the *life* (*nephesh*) of man."

We are now introduced to a new and frequent use of the word *nephesh*. It is here affirmed that the *nephesh*—soul—of the flesh, is the *blood*: but is applied, as before, to both man and beast, being rendered life. In the fourth verse it relates to beasts, and in the fifth to men, but meaning the same thing. In these passages, and similar ones, we have an example of the synecdoche,\* which frequently occurs in the Bible. The Scriptures affirm of Christ, that "he laid down his life (*psuche*) for us, and we ought to lay down our lives (*psuche*) † for the brethren."—1 John 3: 16. *Psuche*, in the New, corresponds with *nephesh* in the Old Testament. "The Son of man came.... to give his *life* (*psuche*) a ransom for many."—Matt. 20: 28. In another place we read, he "gave *himself* a ransom for all."—1 Tim. 2: 6. Without giving more examples, it will be seen that *life* is frequently put for the whole man, because man without life knows nothing, and can be of no service to any one.

But what is *life*? Is it an organized being or entity? Greenfield, in his lexicon, defines life to be "animated existence, state of being alive." Life, then, is not a being, but a *principle*.—Hence, when *nephesh* (Heb.) and *psuche* (Greek) stand for the *life* of man, it is proper to say, in the language of Bishop Tillotson, "The soul of man is an active *principle*." But this principle is common to *all* living creatures. "In whose hand is the soul (*nephesh*) of *every living thing*, and the breath of all man kind."—Job 12: 10. This passage shows that every *living thing* has soul—more properly rendered life in this example. Again, "A righteous man regardeth the *life* (*nephesh*) of his beast."—Prov. 12: 10. We take the life of man and of beast. Do we

---

\* In rhetoric, a figure or trope by which the whole of a thing is put for a part, or a part for the whole.

† When we introduce Greek or Hebrew nouns, instead of giving their varied numbers, persons, and cases, as they occur in different passages, we give the simple form of the word, thinking it will be plainer to our readers.



take an immortal soul from them? or let one escape? Certainly not; but we end their "animated existence"

"For whosoever will save his *life* (*psuche*) shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his *life* (*psuche*) for my sake shall find it. For what is a man profited if he shall gain the whole world and lose his own *soul*, (*psuche*)? or what shall a man give in exchange for his *soul*," (*psuche*)?—Matt. 16: 25, 26.

When a man's *life* is gone, all the world is worthless to him. Verse 25 would read strangely, to say, whosoever will save his immortal soul shall lose it. Dr. Clark says of this Scripture,— "On what authority many have translated the word *psuche*, in the 25th verse, *life*, and in this (26th) verse, *soul*, I know not; but am certain it means *life* in both places."

When a ship perishes on the ocean with its passengers, we say, so many *lives* were lost. Do we mean so many immortal souls were lost? or, that those men and women have lost the principle of life, and they themselves are sunk in the depths of the sea? If we shoot a man and a lamb through the heart, have we killed both, or only the lamb, and sent the man to heaven, or hell torment? "What saith the Scripture?" "As the one dieth, so dieth the other."—Eccl. 3: 19.

The Septuagint of Eccl. 3: 19, 21, reads:

"As is the death of the one so also the death of the other; and there is *one breath to all*; and what has the man more than the beast? nothing; for all is vanity. *All* go to one place; *all* were formed of the dust, and *all* will return to dust. And who has seen the spirit (not spirits) of the sons of man, whether it (not they) goes upward, and the spirit of the beast whether it goeth downward to the earth?"

Solomon is moved to speak against the false philosophy of his day, which was, that when a bad man died, his spirit went down among the beasts for punishment, and at the end of three thousand years was permitted to enter the body of a man again; but good spirits ascended higher at death. Solomon meets these philosophers by saying, that men and beasts die alike, and all go to one place—"all were formed of the dust, and all will return to dust;" not, some will go into beasts and others become gods.

Herodotus, the oldest historian whose writings are preserved, says:

"The Egyptians say that Ceres [the goddess of corn] and Bacchus [the god of wine] hold the chief sway in the infernal regions; and the *Egyptians* also were the *first* who asserted the doctrine that the soul of man is *immortal*."  
—Herc. l. p 144.

We have now found the origin of the doctrine. Are we prepared to adopt their doctrine about the infernal regions, of Ceres, and Bacchus? We may do so with as much propriety as we may receive from them the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. It is very singular that the Egyptian heathen found that the soul was immortal before it was revealed to the Hebrews—God's peculiar people; who, by the way, never did learn any such doctrine from their scriptures, but when they did receive it, they adopted the belief from the heathen.

Gibbon very truly remarks, "The doctrine of the immortality of the soul is omitted in the law of Moses."—Gib. v. 1, p. 530-1. Twenty-five hundred years had passed when Moses wrote, but God had nowhere taught his children that the soul, or any part of man, was immortal. Satan had taught such a doctrine to our first parents. Job, a cotemporary with Moses, shows most clearly in his writings that he believed the whole man dies and remains dead till the resurrection. See Job 14: 10—14.

"But *man dieth* and wasteth away; yea, man giveth up the ghost and where is he? As the waters fail from the sea, and the flood decayeth and drieth up; so *man lieth down* and riseth not; till the heavens be no more, they shall not awake nor be raised out of their sleep. O that thou wouldst hide me in the *grave (sheol)*, that thou wouldst keep me secret until thy wrath be past, that thou wouldst appoint me a set time, and remember me. If a *man die* shall he live *again*? All the days of my appointed time will I wait till my change come."

In the Bishop's Bible, the tenth verse reads: "But as for man when he is *dead, perished and consumed* away, what becometh of him?"

Why is the Bible silent on the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, if it is truth? It seems clear that it is a heathen dogma; and shall we believe heathen philosophers? or God and the sacred Scriptures?

When contrasting a tree cut down, with a man who has died, the Septuagint of Job 14: 10-12 reads:

"But a man that has died is *utterly gone*; and when a mortal is fallen, *he is no more*. For the sea wastes in length of time, and a river fails and is dried up. And a man that has lain down in death shall *certainly not rise again* till the heaven be dissolved, and they shall not *awake* from their sleep."

When men see that they are not immortal, they begin to inquire, how can I obtain immortality? "What saith the Scrip



ture?"—"By patient continuance in well doing, *seek for glory and honor and immortality.*"—Rom. 2: 7.

We pass on in our examination, and come to the 10th, 11th, 12th and 13th examples, where *nephesh* is used, which are found in Gen. 9: 10, 12, 15 and 16, and applied to beasts. Verse 10.—“And with every *living creature (nephesh chaiyah)* that is with you, of the fowl, of the cattle, and of every beast of the earth with you; from all that go out of the ark, to every beast of the earth.” In this passage, every animal is called just what *man* is called in Gen. 2: 7—“a living soul,” (*nephesh chaiyah.*) Ver. 12. “And God said, This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you, and every *living creature (nephesh chaiyah)* that is with you.” Verse 15. “And I will remember my covenant which is between me and you, and every *living creature (nephesh chaiyah)* of all flesh.” Verse 16. “And the bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every *living creature (nephesh chaiyah)* of all flesh that is upon the earth.” These passages are too plain to need comment. Soul, or *nephesh*, is used in these examples in its *primary* sense, meaning the whole creature. Take another example in Ezk. 47: 9. “And it shall come to pass, that every *thing (nephesh)* that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers shall come, shall live.” The word *thing*, representing the fish in the rivers, cannot mean “immortal, never dying souls,” but simply that every creature is a *soul*.

We pass to the *fourteenth* example, where the word *nephesh* occurs, which is in Gen. 12: 5. “And Abram took Sarai his wife, and Lot his brother’s son, and all their substance that they had gathered, and the *souls* that they had gotten in Haran; and they went forth to go into the land of Canaan.” There can be no doubt that “souls” in this Scripture refer to the whole beings, and it is also evident that they had no existence before they were “gotten in Haran.”

We have now come down the stream of time over *two thousand* years, but have not found the least evidence that man is an “immortal soul,” or that he has one in him. Why all this silence? Why no intimation that death only applies to the *body*, or “house” in which a man lives? We have passed over many records of death, but find no hint that any part of the man is alive between death and the resurrection.

Let us return and look at the Bible necrology. The first is a murder, recorded in Gen. 4: 8-10. "And Cain talked with Abel his brother; and it came to pass, when they were in the field, that Cain rose up against Abel his brother, and *slew him*." Did he send the good man to heaven by this means? Read on.—"And the Lord said unto Cain, Where is Abel thy brother? And he said, I know not; am I my brother's keeper? And he said, What hast thou done? the voice (not of Abel) of thy brother's *blood crieth* unto me from the *ground*." Observe, the Lord does not say, Abel's soul has come to me declaring that you have killed *him*! Where is Abel? Let Paul answer. Heb. 11: 4. "By faith Abel offered unto God a more excellent sacrifice than Cain, by which he obtained witness that he *was* righteous, God testifying of his gifts; and by it, he *being dead*, yet speaketh," or as in the margin, "is spoken of." We see that Paul declares Abel is yet *dead*.

The next death is recorded in Gen. 5: 5. "And all the days that *Adam* lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and *he died*." This proves Satan a liar, for he said Adam should not die. How is it possible to get the idea from the Bible that Adam is now alive, unless we believe Satan?

The next record is in Gen. 5: 8. "And all the days of Seth were nine hundred and twelve years; and *he died*." Ver. 11.—"And all the days of Enos were nine hundred and five years; and he died." Were these men *alive* when they were *dead*? It so, how do we know but they were *dead* when *alive*? Similar records to the foregoing continue till we come to Enoch, ver. 24. "And Enoch walked with God, and he *was* not, for God took him." Says Paul, in Heb. 11: 5, "By faith Enoch *was* translated that he should not see *death*." He went *bodily*, or in other words, *Enoch* was taken, and as *he* went, all others *will* go—that is, *bodily*. We find no promise of seeing God *out* of the body. Job says, "Though after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my *flesh* shall I see God."—Job 19: 26. This Scripture cannot be fulfilled without a resurrection of the *dead*. Job does not intimate that he shall see God *out* of his flesh, but says, "*Man* lieth down, and riseth not till the heavens be no more, they shall not *awake*, nor be raised out of their *sleep*."—Job 14: 12. But, says David, "I shall be satisfied when *I awake* with thy likeness."—



Ps. 17: 15. Says Paul, when speaking of the work of Christ "Who shall change our *vile body*, that *it* may be fashioned like unto his glorious body."—Phil. 3: 21. Why do not some of the Bible writers tell us that when man dies he goes to heaven? We can find no proof that man exists in a conscious state out of his body. The idea is *absurd*.

MY SOUL.—The 15th text where the word *nephesh* occurs, is in Gen. 12: 13. "Say, I pray thee, thou art my sister; that it may be well with me for thy sake; and *my soul shall live* because of thee." The plain inference from this passage is, that he feared his soul would not live unless the advice given be followed. What is the meaning of the phrase, "my soul," which frequently occurs in the Bible? Some seem to have the idea it represents an immortal part, which exists independently of the body, and at death goes to heaven or a hell of suffering. We think the truth on this subject will be very plain after a little examination. It is proper to substitute *life* for *soul* in any passage in the Bible, where it will make sense. We often hear the expression, "we should *live a life* of virtue," so, in the passage under consideration, it would be correct to say, "and *my life shall live*;" or in other words, I shall live, myself shall live.

We now assume that "my soul," "me" and "myself" are synonymous expressions. "Let *me* [margin, *my soul*] die the death of the righteous, and my last end be like his."—Num. 23: 10. Here we see that "*me*" from *nephesh*, means the same as "my soul." Either form is correct. Had our translators rendered *nephesh*, soul, in this passage, it would have overthrown the idea that the soul is immortal. Again, "So they girded sackcloth on their loins, and put ropes on their heads, and came to the king of Israel, and said, thy servant, Ben-hadad saith, I pray thee let *me* (*nephesh*) live."—1 Kings 20: 32. "For, lo, they lie in wait for *my soul*: the mighty are gathered against me."—Ps. 59: 3. "I humbled *my soul* with *fasting*."—Ps. 35: 13. Does an immortal soul, that can exist independently of an organism, become humbled by fasting? The plain meaning of the passage is, that David humbled *himself* by fasting. When he says, "they lie in wait for *my soul*," the obvious meaning is, "they lie in wait for" *me*, or *my life*, not for an immortal soul hid away in some obscure recess of David's body. "Surely I have behaved

*immortal soul x*

and quieted *myself* (margin, my soul) as a child tha is weaned of his mother."—Ps. 131: 2. Here we have *nephesh* rendered *myself*, which gives the correct idea. "Let *me* (margin, my soul) die with the Philistines."—Judges 16: 30. In this passage, *nephesh* is rendered "me." The marginal reading shows that the *soul* may die, and there is no way to avoid the conclusion that what is represented by the word *nephesh* may die, whether it be a part of the man, or the whole being.

When David used the phrase, "my soul" it is evident he did not mean another man in himself. From passages quoted, we think it is clear that "my soul," "me" and myself," when translated from *nephesh*, mean the same thing—the *whole man*—as when first employed to represent him in Gen. 2: 7.

"Shall evil be recompensed for good? for they have digged a pit for *my soul*."—Jer. 18: 20. Let us turn to the place where we have a record of the consummation of the event referred to in this passage. "Then took they *Jeremiah*, and cast *him* into the *dungeon* of Malchiah."—Jer. 38: 6. The last passage quoted shows that the "my soul" which was to be cast into the pit was the man Jeremiah.

We think this point is plain; and if the phrase, "my soul," is equivalent to "me" and "myself," we would naturally conclude that "his soul" means the same as *himself* or *he*.

HIS SOUL.—What saith the Scripture? "He (*nephesh*) that laboreth, laboreth for himself."—Prov. 16: 26. In the margin we have *soul* instead of *he*. "He sent a man before them, even Joseph, who was sold for a servant; whose feet they hurt with fetters; *he* (*nephesh*, margin, his soul,) was laid in iron."—Ps. 105: 17—18. No one supposes that Joseph had an immortal soul which "was laid in iron." But the *nephesh*—the man Joseph—"was laid in iron." "And Reuben heard it, and he delivered him out of their hands; and said, let us not kill *him*," (*nephesh*.) Gen. 37: 21. In this Scripture *nephesh* is rendered *him*, and it is plainly shown that the *nephesh* or man may be *killed*. Again we read, "Lest the avenger of blood pursue the slayer, while his heart is hot, and overtake him, because the way is long, and slay *him*," (*nephesh*.) Deut. 19: 6. "None can keep alive his *own* soul." Ps. 22: 29. Should we conclude from this passage that the soul is immortal and can never die? "And he (*Elijah*) re-



quested for *himself* (*nephesh*) that he might die.' 1 Kings 19: 4. This text shows that *nephesh* stands for the whole man, and that *himself* is equivalent to "his soul." "Neither shall the mighty deliver *himself* (*nephesh*, margin, his soul.) Amos 2: 14. "He teareth *himself*, (*nephesh*, margin his soul) in his anger."—Job 18: 4. Does he tear his immortal soul? "He justifieth *himself* (*nephesh*, margin his soul) rather than God."—Job 32: 2. We do not see how further quotations can make it plainer that "his soul" is synonymous with "himself," "he" and "him," each meaning the *whole man*.

OUR SOUL.—The same remarks are true of "our soul." "Let them not say in their hearts, ah, so would *we* (*nephesh*, margin, our soul) have it."—Ps. 35: 25.

YOUR SOUL.—Again, "your souls" mean the same as *your selves*. "Ye shall not make *yourselves* (*nephesh*, margin, your souls) abominable with any creeping thing."—Lev. 11: 43. "Thus saith the Lord, deceive not *yourselves*," (*nephesh*, margin, your souls.)—Jer. 37: 9. Many similar examples might be brought if necessary.

THEIR SOUL.—We will look at a few passages where the phrase "their soul" is equivalent to "themselves." "As they had decreed for *themselves*," (*nephesh*, margin, their souls.)—Esther 9: 31. "*Themselves* (*nephesh*, margin, their soul) are gone into captivity."—Isa. 46: 2. "They shall deliver *themselves* (*nephesh*, margin, their souls) from the power of the *flame*."—Isa. 47: 14. "*They* (*nephesh*, their soul) *die* in youth."—Job 36: 14. Here it is plainly taught that souls *die*.

The same remarks are true of "her soul" and "thy soul." Her soul and herself are used interchangeably, and thy soul and thyself.

In the examples we have been considering, we have the *primary* use of *nephesh*, which represents the *whole being*. Whenever we say, "O my soul, praise the Lord," it is equivalent to saying, O me, or myself, praise the Lord; but the latter is not so elegant. When we say, "Our souls are sad," it is the same as to say, we are sad.

The 16th text where *nephesh* occurs is in Gen. 14: 21. "And the king of Sodom said unto Abram, give me the *persons* (*nephesh*, margin, souls) and take the goods to thyself." Here *we have*

another example of the *primary* meaning of *nephesh*. It is rendered person thirty times in the Old Testament. This is a plain, simple rendering of the word, and many passages would be better understood if *person* were substituted for *soul*.

17th example. "That *soul* shall be cut off from his people."—Gen. 17: 14. Here is the primary use of *nephesh*.

18th text. "And it came to pass when they had brought them forth abroad, that he said, escape for thy *life*, (*nephesh*) look not behind thee, neither stay thou in all the plain, escape to the mountain, lest thou be consumed."—Gen. 19: 17. This is the angel's instruction to Lot when he left Sodom. In this example *nephesh* is used in its secondary sense; but, as we have before found, it is used in the same sense when applied to the brute creation, and never represents, when thus used, a separate, conscious identity.

The 19th example is in the 19th verse of this same chapter. "Behold now, thy servant hath found grace in thy sight, and thou hast magnified thy mercy, which thou hast showed unto me in saving my *life*, (*nephesh*) and I cannot escape to the mountain, lest some evil take me, and I die." We apprehend Lot knew nothing about the popular idea of these days, that when a good man *dies*, he goes to live in glory, before the resurrection of the dead; if so, why so anxious to stay out of heaven, and live in the wicked world?

20th text. "Behold now, this city is near to flee unto, and it is a little one; oh, let *me* escape thither, (is it not a little one?) and my *soul* shall live."—Gen 19: 20. What is the inference? If he does not escape thus, his soul, or *himself* may die. Does he mean that he may keep his immortal soul alive by fleeing into Zoar? The very idea is absurd. "My soul," in this last example, is equivalent to "myself," meaning the whole man.

The 21st text in order, is in Gen. 23: 8. "And he (Abraham) communed with them, saying, if it be your *mind* (*nephesh*) that I should bury my dead out of my sight, hear me." In this example, we have found a new rendering of *nephesh*. It is thus rendered fifteen times out of the seven hundred and fifty-two. See list, page 21.

When *nephesh* is rendered *mind*, it seems to be used to represent *desire*, or a state of feeling, but not a hint that this *nephesh*, mind, feeling or desire is immortal and survives the death of the man.



Let the Bible explain itself, and we think all will be plain on this point. In Deut. 23: 24, we read, "When thou comest into thy neighbor's vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own *pleasure*, (*nephesh*) but thou shalt not put any in thy vessel." *Nephesh* might be rendered *mind* in this last example, as well as in Gen. 23: 8. It is rendered *desire* in the Septuagint. Take another similar example. "To bind his princes at his *pleasure* (*nephesh*) and teach his senators wisdom."—Ps. 105: 22. Again, "But ye turned, and polluted my name, and caused every man his servant, and every man his handmaid, whom he had set at liberty at their *pleasure* (*nephesh*) to return, and brought them into subjection, to be unto you for servants and for handmaids."—Jer. 34: 16. In these examples, we have the true sense of *nephesh* in its fourth and last sense; to wit, a *desire* or state of feeling. "Better is the sight of the eyes than the wandering of the *desire*, (*nephesh*)." Eccl. 6: 9. "And the great man he uttereth his mischievous *desire*, (*nephesh*)."—Micah 7: 3. "But to the land whereunto they *desire* (*nephesh*) to return, thither shall they return."—Jer. 22: 27. In all these examples it would be proper to insert *mind* as in the cases where *nephesh* is thus rendered; but all can see that the word *desire* gives the true idea. A *desire* is not a *being* that exists independent of an organism, going to its reward or punishment when the one who had the desire is *dead*.

*Nephesh* is also rendered *heart* fifteen times. See list, page 22. The remarks we have made in relation to *mind*, when from *nephesh*, are applicable to *heart* when from the same word. In all these examples we find no hint that any conscious part survives the death of *the man*.

*Nephesh* is also rendered *lust*, another word expressing *desire*. See Ps. 78: 18. "And they tempted God in their heart, by asking meat for their *lust*," (*nephesh*). Had the translators have rendered *nephesh* soul, in this passage, then we should understand that the soul desired meat to eat. In that case it must be something more than a "*principle*." Again, in Ex. 15: 9, we read, "The enemy said, I will pursue, I will overtake, I will divide the spoil; my *lust* (*nephesh*) shall be satisfied upon them; I will draw my sword, my hand shall destroy them." Here we have further examples of *nephesh* when used to represent *desire*. "Yea they

are greedy (*nephesh*, margin, strong of appetite,) dogs which can never have enough, and they are shepherds that cannot understand."—Isa. 56: 11. Here, *nephesh* is rendered by another word expressing *desire*. "Then thou shalt let her go whither *she will*," (*nephesh*) that is, where she *desires*.—Deut. 21: 14. "Deliver me not over to *the will* (*nephesh*) of mine enemies;" or, do not yield to their *desire*.—Ps. 27: 12 *Nephesh* is also rendered *the will* in Ezk. 16: 27. "And every one that was in debt, and every one that was *discontented* (*nephesh*) gathered themselves unto him." In this example, *nephesh* is used to express an ungratified *desire*.—1 Sam. 22: 2. "Put a knife to thy throat, if thou be a man given to *appetite*," (*nephesh*).—Prov. 23: 2. Appetite is another word to express strong *desire*.

Without pursuing this point further, we think it is clear that when *nephesh* is rendered *mind*, *desire*, &c., it conveys no idea that something is meant which is conscious when the physical organism is destroyed.

We have now examined the first twenty-one texts in the Bible where *nephesh*, the word rendered soul, occurs, but have found no proof, or even a hint, from which we could draw the most distant inference that man has an *immortal soul*. We have come down the stream of time, in the history of man, over two thousand years, and we stop to inquire, why this total silence on the subject, if popular theology is true? We have carefully examined the creation of man, and many records of deaths, but find no idea advanced that man is alive between death and the resurrection. We think the case is perfectly clear that man, the **WHOLE MAN IS MORTAL**; this being true, Satan is proved a liar, because he declared man to be immortal.

There are two passages which some bring as objections to our conclusion, which we will examine. The first is in Gen. 35: 18, 19, where we have the record of the death of Rachel, the wife of Jacob, at the birth of Benjamin. "And it came to pass, as her soul was in departing, (for she *died*,) that she called his name Ben-oni; but his father called him Benjamin; And *Rachel died*, and was buried in the way to Ephrath, which is Bethlehem." Had *nephesh* been rendered *life* in this passage, as it is in one hundred and twenty other places, and might be in many more, the text would be perfectly plain, and in harmony with all the facts stated



in connection with the death of Rachel. All the reasoning of skillful logicians cannot alter the Scripture declaration—"Rachel died and was buried;" and, "as her NEPHESH (life) was in departing," or, in other words, while she was dying, she named her infant child. The Septuagint reads,—“And it came to pass in her giving up the ghost, (for *she was dying*) that she called his name, The son of my pain, but his father called his name Benjamin.” “Giving up the ghost” is the old Bible way of saying she is dying; and “gave up the ghost” is more properly rendered “expired,” and is thus rendered in the new translation by the Amer Bible Union. We see no proof of an immortal soul in the passage just examined.

The other text, sometimes referred to as an objection to our position, is in 1 Kin. 17: 21, 22, 23. “And he (Elijah) stretched himself upon the *child* three times, and cried unto the Lord and said, O Lord my God, I pray thee, let this child’s *soul* come into him again. And the Lord heard the voice of Elijah; and the soul of the child came into him again, and he revived. And Elijah took the child, and brought him down out of the chamber into the house, and delivered him unto his mother; and Elijah said, see, thy *son liveth*.” Had *nephesh* been rendered *life* in this Scripture, all would be plain. If we turn back to the 17th verse of this chapter, we read in relation to the child, “And it came to pass, after those things, that the son of the woman, the mistress of the house, fell sick, and his sickness was so sore, that there was no breath (*n’shah-mah*) left in him.” Is this *breath* the *child*? no one would be so absurd as to claim it. The *child* lies dead before the prophet. What does the mother desire? That the *life* of the child may be restored. Elijah prays for its restoration, “and the Lord heard the voice of Elijah,” and the *life* of the child is restored. No intimation that the *child* had been to heaven or hell. and was called out, but the child was all this time in the house of the widow. When the breath of *life* came again, “Elijah took the *child* and brought him down out of the chamber....and....said, “see, thy *son liveth*.”

The Septuagint reads, verse 17:

“And it happened that the son of the woman, the mistress of the house fell sick; and the disorder increased till there was no breath left in him.”—vers. 21, 22. “And when he had *breathed* on the child three times and called on the Lord, he said, O Lord, my God, I beseech thee let this child’s **LIFE** be restored to him. And so it came to pass, and the child cried.”

We think this point is so plain that further comment is unnecessary. We know of no other passages in the Old Testament that can be brought in proof of the immortality of the soul.

*Nephesh*, the word rendered soul, is translated in *forty-four* different ways in the common English Bible. We now purpose to give *all* these variations, and quote the texts that contain them.

1. *Nephesh* is rendered *man* four times. "And in the first day there shall be an holy convocation, and in the seventh day there shall be an holy convocation to you; no manner of work shall be done in them, save that which every *man* must eat that only may be done of you."—Ex. 12: 16. "And he that killeth any *man* shall surely be put to death."—Lev. 24: 17. "And Jehovah said. . . all the money that every *man* is set at."—2 Kin. 12: 4. "Thus saith the Lord. . . to him whom *man* despiseth."—Is. 49: 7.

2. *Nephesh* is rendered *men* once. "And they took away their cattle. . . and of *men* an hundred thousand."—1 Chron. 5: 21.

3. *Nephesh* is rendered *him* four times. "And Reuben. . . said, let us not kill *him*."—Gen. 37: 21. "Lest the avenger of blood. . . slay *him*."—Deut. 19: 6. "When a man riseth against his neighbor and slayeth *him*."—Deut. 22: 26. "These six things. . . are an abomination unto *him*."—Prov. 6: 16.

4. *Nephesh* is rendered *himself* eight times. "And he requested for *himself* that he might die."—1 Kings 19: 4. "He teareth *himself* in his anger."—Job 18: 4. "Then was kindled the wrath of Elihu. . . against Job. . . because he justified *himself*."—Job 32: 2. "The Lord of hosts hath sworn by *himself*."—Jer. 51: 14. "Neither shall the mighty deliver *himself*."—Amos 2: 14. "Neither shall he that rideth the horse deliver *himself*."—Ver. 15. "The Lord hath sworn by *himself*."—Amos 6: 8. "Jonah. . . wished in *himself* to die."—Jonah 4: 8.

5. *Nephesh* is rendered *he* twice. "Whose feet they hurt with fetters; *he* was laid in iron."—Ps. 105: 18. "*He* that laboreth, laboreth for *himself*."—Prov. 16: 26.

6. *Nephesh* is rendered *me* three times. "Let *me* die the death of the righteous."—Numb. 23: 10. "And Sampson said, let *me* die with the Philistines."—Judges 16: 30. "Thy servant Benhadad saith, I pray thee, let *me* live."—1 Kings 20: 32.

7. *Nephesh* is rendered *myself* once. "Surely I have behaved and quieted *myself* as a child that is weaned of his mother."—Ps. 131: 2.

8. *Nephesh* is rendered *we* once. "Ah, so would *we* have it."—Ps. 35: 25.

9. *Nephesh* is rendered *her* once. "A wild ass used to the wilderness, that snuffeth up the wind, at *her* pleasure."—Jer. 2: 24.

10. *Nephesh* is rendered *herself* twice. "Therefore hell hath enlarged *herself*."—Isaiah 5: 14. "Backsliding Israel hath justified *herself* more than treacherous Judah."—Jer. 3: 11.

11. *Nephesh* is rendered *thee* twice. "Baalis. . . hath sent Ishmael. . . to slay *thee*."—Jer. 40: 14. "Jonathan. . . spake. . . saying. . . wherefore should he slay *thee*."—Ver. 15.

12. *Nephesh* is rendered *thyself* once. "Answer Esther, think not with *thyself* that thou shalt escape in the king's house."—Esther 4: 13.

13. *Nephesh* is rendered *they* once. "*They* die in youth."—Job 36: 14.

14. *Nephesh* is rendered *themselves* three times. "He sent the letters. . . to confirm these days of Purim. . . as they had decreed for *themselves*, and for their seed."—Esther 9: 31. "They could not deliver the burden, but *themselves* are gone into captivity."—Isaiah 46: 2. "They shall not deliver *themselves* from the power of the flame."—Isaiah 47: 14.

15. *Nephesh* is rendered *yourselves* six times. "Ye shall not make *yourselves* abominable with any creeping thing that creepeth."—Lev. 11: 43. "Neither shall ye defile *yourselves* with any manner of creeping thing."—Ver. 44. "Take ye therefore good heed unto *yourselves*."—Deut. 4: 15. "Take good heed therefore unto *yourselves* that ye love the Lord your God."—Joshua 23: 11. "Thus saith the Lord, take heed to *yourselves*."—Jer. 17: 21. "Thus saith the Lord deceive not *yourselves*."—Jer. 37: 9.



16. *Nephesh* is rendered *any* three times. "And when *any* will offer a meat offering unto the Lord."—Lev. 2: 1. "He that toucheth the dead body of *any* man shall be unclean seven days."—Num. 19: 11. "If a man be found steal *any* of his brethren....then that thief shall die." Deut. 24: 7.

17. *Nephesh* is rendered *one* once. "If *any one* of the common people sin through ignorance."—Lev. 4: 27.

18. *Nephesh* is rendered *lust* twice. "The enemy said..I will divide the spoil; my *lust* shall be satisfied upon them."—Ex. 15: 9. "And they tempted God in their heart, by asking meat for their *lust*."—Psalms 78: 18.

19. *Nephesh* is rendered *ghost* twice. "The eyes of the wicked shall fail, and they shall be as the giving up of the *ghost*."—Job 11: 20. "She hath given up the *ghost*; her sun has gone down while it was yet day."—Jer. 15: 9.

20. *Nephesh* is rendered *thing* twice. "Any living *thing* which is in the waters."—Lev. 11: 10. "And it shall come to pass, that every *thing* that liveth, which moveth, whithersoever the rivers shall come, shall live."—Ezk. 47: 9.

21. *Nephesh* is rendered *his own* once. "The heart knoweth *his own* bitterness."—Prov. 14: 10.

22. *Nephesh* is rendered *she will* once. "Thou shalt let her go whither *she will*."—Deut. 21: 14.

23. *Nephesh* is rendered *mortally* once. "If any man hate his neighbor.... and smite him *mortally* that he die."—Deut. 19: 11.

24. *Nephesh* is rendered *will* three times. "Deliver me not over to the *will* of mine enemies."—Psa. 27: 12. "Thou wilt not deliver him unto the *will* of his enemies."—Psalms 41: 2. "Behold, therefore, I have....delivered thee unto the *will* of them that hate thee."—Ezk. 16: 27.

25. *Nephesh* is rendered *tablets* once. "In that day the Lord will take away....the *tablets*."—Isaiah 3: 20.

26. *Nephesh* is rendered *the dead* five times. "Ye shall not make any cuttings in your flesh for *the dead*."—Lev. 19 28. "There shall none be defiled for *the dead*."—Lev. 21: 1. "Whoso toucheth any thing that is unclean by *the dead*....shall be unclean until even."—Lev. 22: 4. "Put out of the camp.... whosoever is defiled by *the dead*."—Num. 5: 2. "Make an atonement for him, for that he sinned by the dead."—Num 6: 11.

27. *Nephesh* is rendered *fellows* once. "Let not thy voice be heard among us, lest angry *fellows* run upon thee and thou lose thy life with the lives of thy household."—Judges 18: 25.

28. *Nephesh* is rendered *discontented* once. "And every one that was *discontented* gathered themselves unto him."—1 Sam. 22: 2.

29. *Nephesh* is rendered *greedy* once. "Yea, they are *greedy* dogs which can never have enough."—Isaiah 56: 11.

30. *Nephesh* is rendered *breath* once. "His *breath* kindleth coals."—Job 41: 21.

31. *Nephesh* is rendered *deadly* once. "My *deadly* enemies who compass me about."—Psalms 17: 9.

32. *Nephesh* is rendered *heartly* once. "Ointment and perfume rejoice the heart; so doth the sweetness of a man's friend by *heartly* counsel."—Prov. 27: 9.

33. *Nephesh* is rendered *appetite* twice. "Put a knife to thy throat, if thou be a man given to *appetite*."—Prov. 23: 2. "All the labor of man is for his mouth, and yet the *appetite* is not filled."—Eccl. 6: 7.

34. *Nephesh* is rendered *pleasure* three times. "When thou comest into thy neighbor's vineyard, then thou mayest eat grapes thy fill at thine own *pleasure*, but thou shalt not put any in thy vessel."—Deut. 23: 24. "To bind his princes at *pleasure* and teach his senators wisdom."—Psalms 105: 22. "Whom he had set at liberty at their *pleasure*."—Jeremiah 34: 16.

35. *Nephesh* is rendered *fish* once. "Sluices and ponds for *fish*."—Isaiah 19: 10.

36. *Nephesh* is rendered *desire* five times. "The wandering of the *desire*."—Eccl. 6: 9. "The land whereunto they *desire* to return."—Jer. 22: 27. "Return into the land of Judah, to which they have a *desire* to return."—Jer. 44: 14. "He uttereth his mischievous *desire*."—Micah 7: 3. "A proud man....enlargeth his *desire*."—Hab. 2: 5.

37. *Nephesh* is rendered *mind* fifteen times. "If it be your *mind* that I should bury my dead out of my sight."—Gen. 23: 8. "If a Levite come....

with all the desire of his *mind*."—Deut. 18: 6. "Sorrow of *mind*."—Deut. 28: 65. "Shall do according to that which is in... my *mind*."—1 Sam. 2: 35. "They be chafed in their *minds*."—2 Sam. 17: 8. "If it be your *minds*."—2 Kings 9: 15. "Serve him with a... willing *mind*."—1 Chron. 28: 9. "My *mind* could not be toward this people."—Jer. 15: 1. "Her *mind* was alienated from them."—Ezk. 23: 17. "Then my *mind* was alienated from her, like as my *mind* was alienated from her sister."—Ezk. 23: 18. "Thy *mind* is alienated."—Ezk. 23: 22. "From whom thy *mind* is alienated."—Ezk. 23: 28. "That whereupon they set their *minds*."—Ezk. 24: 25. "With despitful *minds*."—Ezk. 36: 5.

38. *Nephesh* is rendered *heart* fifteen times. "Ye know the *heart* of a stranger."—Ex. 23: 9. "And cause sorrow of *heart*."—Lev. 26: 16. "Setteth his *heart* upon it."—Deut. 24: 15. "Grieve thine *heart*."—1 Sam. 2: 33. "All that thine *heart* desireth."—2 Sam. 3: 21. "The wicked boasteth of his *heart's* desire."—Ps. 10: 3. "As he thinketh in his *heart* so is he."—Prov. 23: 7. "He that is of a proud *heart* stirreth up strife."—Prov. 28: 25. "Those that be of heavy *hearts*."—Prov. 31: 6. "Ye dissembled in your *hearts*."—Jer. 42: 20. "Mine eye affecteth my *heart*."—Lam. 3: 51. "Rejoiced in *heart*."—Ezk. 25: 6. "A despitful *heart*."—Ezk. 25: 15. "Weep for the bitterness of *heart*."—Ezk. 27: 31. "They set their *heart* on their iniquity."—Hosea 4: 8.

39. *Nephesh* is rendered *creature* nine times. "And God created great whales, and every living *creature* that moveth."—Gen. 1: 21. "And God said, let the earth bring forth the living *creature* after his kind."—Gen. 1: 24. "Whatsoever Adam called every living *creature*, that was the name thereof."—Gen. 2: 19. "I establish my covenant with... every living *creature*."—Gen. 9: 10. "This is the token of the covenant which I make between me and you and every living *creature*."—Gen. 9: 12. "I will remember my covenant, which is between you and every living *creature* of all flesh."—Gen. 9: 15. "The bow shall be in the cloud; and I will look upon it, that I may remember the everlasting covenant between God and every living *creature*."—Gen. 9: 16. "This is the law of the beasts, and of the fowl, and of every living *creature* that moveth in the waters, and of every *creature* that creepeth upon the earth."—Lev. 11: 46.

40. *Nephesh* is rendered *beast* twice. "He that killeth a *beast* shall make it good; *beast* for *beast*."—Lev. 24: 18.

41. *Nephesh* is rendered *body* seven times. "Neither shall ye go in to any dead *body*."—Lev. 21: 11. "He shall come at no dead *body*."—Num. 6: 6. "Men who were defiled by the dead *body* of a man."—Num. 9: 6. "We are defiled by the dead *body* of a man."—Num. 9: 7. "Unclean by reason of a dead *body*."—Num. 9: 10. "Whosoever toucheth the dead *body* of any man."—Num. 19: 13. "Then said Haggai, if one that is unclean by a dead *body* touch any of these, shall it be unclean?"—Haggai 2: 13.

42. *Nephesh* is rendered *life* and *lives* one hundred and twenty times, and is applied indiscriminately to man and beast. "Let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving *creature* that hath *life*."—Gen. 1: 20. "Every thing that creepeth upon the earth, wherein there is *life*."—Gen. 1: 30. "Flesh with the *life* thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat."—Gen. 9: 4. "And surely your blood of your *lives* will I require;... at the hand of every man's brother will I require the *life* of man."—Gen. 9: 5. "He said, escape for thy *life*."—Gen. 19: 17. "Thou hast magnified thy mercy... in saving my *life*."—Gen. 19: 19. "My *life* is preserved."—Gen. 32: 30. "Seeing that his *life* is bound up in the lad's *life*."—Gen. 44: 30. "The Lord said unto Moses in Midian, go return into Egypt; for all the men are dead which sought thy *life*."—Ex. 4: 19. "Thou shalt give *life* for *life*."—Ex. 21: 23. "He shall give for the ransom of his *life*, whatsoever is laid upon him."—Ex. 21: 30. "For the *life* of the flesh is in the blood."—Lev. 17: 11. "It is the *life* of all flesh; the blood of it is for the *life* thereof; therefore I said unto the children of Israel, ye shall eat the blood of no manner of flesh; for the *life* of all flesh is the blood thereof."—Lev. 17: 14. "Ye shall take no satisfaction for the *life* of a murderer."—Num. 35: 31. "Be sure that thou eat not the blood; for the blood is the *life*; and thou mayest not eat the *life* with the flesh."—Deut. 12: 23. "*Life* shall go for *life*."—Deut. 19: 21. "No man shall take the... mill-stone to pledge; for he taketh a man's *life* to pledge."—Deut. 24: 6.



'Deliver our *lives* from death.'—Josh. 2: 13. 'Our *life* for yours.'—Josh. 2: 14. 'We were sore afraid of our *lives*.'—Josh. 9: 24. 'A people that jeopardarded their *lives*.'—Jud. 5: 18. 'My father fought for you, and adventured his *life* far.'—Jud. 9: 17. 'I put my *life* in my hands.'—Jud. 12: 3. 'Let not thy voice be heard among us lest...thou lose thy *life* with the *lives* of thy household.'—Jud. 18: 25. 'He shall be unto thee a restorer of thy *life*.'—Ruth 4: 15. 'He did put his *life* in his hand and slew the Philistines.'—1 Sam. 19: 5. 'If thou save not thy *life* to-night, to-morrow thou shalt be slain.'—1 Sam. 19: 11. 'What is my sin before thy father, that he seeketh my *life*?'—1 Sam. 20: 1. 'He that seeketh my *life* seeketh thy *life*.'—1 Sam. 22: 23. 'David saw that Saul was come out to seek his *life*.'—1 Sam. 23: 15. 'As thy *life* was much set by this day in mine eyes, so let my *life* be much set by in the eyes of the Lord.'—1 Sam. 26: 24. 'Wherefore then layest thou a snare for my *life* to cause me to die.'—1 Sam. 28: 9. 'I have put my *life* in my hand.'—1 Sam. 28: 21. 'Slay me, for anguish is come upon me, because my *life* is yet whole in me.'—2 Sam. 1: 9. 'Behold the head of Ishbosheth...which sought thy *life*.'—2 Sam. 4: 8. 'Kill him for the *life* of his brother whom he slew.'—2 Sam. 14: 7. 'And David said...behold, my son...seeketh my *life*.'—2 Sam. 16: 11. 'Otherwise I should have wrought falsehood against my own *life*.'—2 Sam. 18: 13. 'This day have saved thy *life* and the *lives* of thy wives, and the *lives* of thy concubines.'—2 Sam. 19: 5. 'The men that went in jeopardy of their *lives*.'—2 Sam. 23: 17. 'Save thine own *life*, and the *life* of thy son Solomon.'—1 Kin. 1: 12. 'Spoken this word against his own *life*.'—1 Kin. 2: 23. 'Nor hast asked the *life* of thine enemies.'—1 Kin. 3: 11. 'Thy *life* as the *life* of one of them.'—1 Kin. 19: 2. 'He arose and went for his *life*.'—1 Kin. 19: 3. 'O Lord, take away my *life*.'—1 Kin. 19: 4. 'They seek my *life* to take it away.'—1 Kin. 19: 10. 'They seek my *life* to take it away.'—1 Kin. 19: 14. 'Peradventure he will save thy *life*.'—1 Kin. 20: 31. 'Thy *life* be for his *life*.'—1 Kin. 20: 39. 'Thy *life* shall go for his *life*.'—1 Kin. 20: 42. 'Let my *life* and the *life* of these fifty...be precious in thy sight.'—2 Kin. 1: 13. 'Let my *life* now be precious in thy sight.'—2 Kin. 1: 14. 'Fled for their *life*.'—2 Kin. 7: 7. 'He that letteth him go, his *life* shall be for the *life* of him.'—2 Kin. 10: 24. 'Men that have put their *lives* in jeopardy, for with the jeopardy of their *lives* they brought it.'—1 Chron. 11: 19. 'The *life* of thine enemies.'—2 Chron. 1: 11. 'Let my *life* be given me.'—Esther 7: 3. 'Haman stood up to make request for his *life*.'—Esther 7: 7. 'The king granted the Jews...to stand for their *life*.'—Esther 8: 11. 'The...Jews...stood for their *lives*.'—Esther 9: 16. 'All that a man hath will he give for his *life*.'—Job 2: 4. 'Save his *life*.'—Job 2: 6. 'Prolong my *life*.'—Job 6: 11. 'Put my *life* in mine hand.'—Job. 13: 14. 'If I have...caused the owners thereof to lose their *life*.'—Job. 31: 39. 'They devised to take away my *life*.'—Psalms 31: 13. 'They...seek after my *life*.'—Ps. 38: 12. 'They lurk privily for their own *lives*.'—Prov. 1: 18. 'Taketh away the *life* of the owners.'—Prov. 1: 19. 'The adulteress will hunt for the precious *life*.'—Prov. 6: 26. 'A bird hasteth to the snare and knoweth not that it is for his *life*.'—Prov. 7: 23. 'A righteous man regardeth the *life* of his beast.'—Prov. 12: 10. 'He that keepeth his mouth, keepeth his *life*.'—Prov. 13: 3. 'The ransom of a man's *life*.'—Prov. 13: 8. 'His *life* shall be grievous unto him.'—Isa. 15: 4. 'Therefore will I give...people for thy *life*.'—Isa. 43: 4. 'They will seek thy *life*.'—Jer. 4: 30. 'The men of Anathoth...seek thy *life*.'—Jer. 11: 21. 'Fall...by the hand of them that seek their *lives*.'—Jer. 19: 7. 'They that seek their *lives*.'—Jer. 19: 9. 'Those that seek their *life*.'—Jer. 21: 7. 'His *life* shall be unto him for a prey.'—Jer. 21: 9. 'Into the hand of them that seek thy *life*.'—Jer. 22: 25. 'Into the hand of them that seek their *life*.'—Jer. 34: 20. 'Into the hand of them that seek their *life*.'—Jer. 34: 21. 'He shall make his *life* for a prey.'—Jer. 38: 2. 'Men that seek thy *life*.'—Jer. 38: 16. 'Thy *life* shall be for a prey unto thee.'—Jer. 39: 18. 'I will give Pharaoh-hopra...into the hands of them that seek his *life*, as I gave Zedekiah...into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar...that sought his *life*.'—Jer. 44: 30. 'Thy *life* will I give unto thee for a prey.'—Jer. 45: 5. 'Those that seek their *lives*.'—Jer. 46: 26. 'Flee, save your *lives*.'—Jer. 48: 6. 'Dismayed...before them that seek their *life*.'—Jer. 49: 37. 'Lift up thy hands...for the *life* of thy young children.'—Lam. 2: 19. 'We gat our bread with the peril of our *lives*.'—Lam 5: 9. 'Every man

for his own *life*.'...Ezk. 32: 10. 'Let us not perish for this man's *life*.'...J<sup>o</sup>h<sup>a</sup>n<sup>a</sup>n<sup>h</sup> 1: 14. 'O Lord, take, I beseech thee, my *life* from me.'...Jonah 4: 3. *Total* 120.

43. *Nepesh* is rendered *person* thirty times. 'Give me the *persons*, and take the goods to thyself.'...Gen. 14: 21. 'Esau took....all the *persons* of his house.'...Gen. 36: 6. 'Gather of it every man....according to the number of your *persons*.'...Ex. 16: 16. 'The *persons* shall be for the Lord.'...Lev. 27: 2. 'That *person* be guilty.'...Num. 5: 6. 'Upon the *persons* that were there.'...Num. 19: 18. 'Whosoever hath killed any *person*.'...Num. 31: 19. 'Thirty and two thousand *persons*.'...Num. 31: 35. 'The *persons* were sixteen thousand, of which the Lord's tribute was thirty and two *persons*.'...Num. 31: 40. 'Sixteen thousand *persons*.'...Num. 31: 46. 'Which killeth any *person*.'...Num. 35: 11. 'That killeth any *person*.'...Num. 35: 15. 'Whoso killeth any *person*....one witness shall not testify against any *person* to cause him to die.'...Num. 35: 30. 'Threescore and ten *persons*.'...Deut. 10: 22. 'An innocent *person*.'...Deut. 27: 25. 'That killeth any *person*.'...Josh. 20: 3. 'Whosoever killeth any *person*.'...Josh. 20: 9. 'The death of all the *persons* of thy father's house.'...1 Sam. 22: 22. 'Neither doth God respect any *person*.'...2 Sam. 14: 14. 'Blood of any *person*.'...Prov. 28: 17. 'Johanan....took....every *person*.'...Jer. 43: 6. 'Carried away captive from Jerusalem eight hundred thirty and two *persons*.'...Jer. 52: 29. 'Seven hundred forty and five *persons*; all the *persons* were four thousand and six hundred.'...Jer. 52: 30. 'Loathing of thy *person*.'...Ezk. 16: 5. 'Cut off many *persons*.'...Ezk. 17: 17. 'They traded the *persons* of men.'...Ezk. 27: 13. 'If the sword come and take any *person* from among them.'...Ezk. 33: 6. *Total*, 30.

44. *Nepesh* is rendered *soul* four hundred and seventy-five times, out of seven hundred and fifty-two. The forty-four renderings of *nepesh* may be reduced to four; viz.: '*creature*,' '*person*,' '*life*,' and '*desire*.'

I CLASS. This will include the following four renderings of *nepesh*; to wit: *creature*, beast, thing, and fish.

II CLASS. This includes the following twenty-five; to wit: *person*, man, him, me, yourselves, himself, we, he, myself, her, thee, soul, herself, thyself, themselves, dead, body, one, any, they, men, own, fellow, deadly, and tablets.

III CLASS. This includes the following four; to wit: *life*, ghost, mortally and breath.

IV CLASS. This includes the following eleven; to wit: *desire*, mind, heart, lust, she will, pleasure, discontented, will, greedy, hearty, appetite.

#### PSUCHE.

We now commence the examination of *psuche*, the Greek word rendered *soul* in the NEW TESTAMENT. This word means the same in Greek, as *nepesh* in Hebrew. As we have not been able to find in the Old Testament any intimation that *nepesh* stands for an immortal part in man; we should be surprised to find the New Testament contradicting the Old. We shall expect to find complete harmony.

The word *psuche* is the only word rendered *soul* in the New Testament, and occurs one hundred and five times, and is rendered in six different ways.

In the Old Testament, we found *nepesh* was used *primarily* to express the whole being. *Psuche* is used in the same sense in the New Testament. "Then they that gladly received his word were baptized, and the same day there were added unto them about three thousand *souls*, (*psuche*.)"—Acts 2: 41. "And fear

\* We give the simple form of the word, that it may be plainer to all.



came upon every *soul*," (*psuche*)—Acts 2: 43. "And it shall come to pass, that every *soul*, (*psuche*) that will not hear that prophet, shall be destroyed from among the people."—Acts 3: 23. "Then sent Joseph, and called his father Jacob to him, and all his kindred, threescore and fifteen *souls*," (*psuche*.)—Acts 7: 14. We were in all in the ship, two hundred threescore and sixteen *souls*," (*psuche*.)—Acts 27: 37.

In all the foregoing examples, it is very plain that *psuche* represents the *whole person*, and not a conscious existence separate from the man. Paul quotes from Gen. 2: 7, and says, "So it is written, the first man Adam was made a living *soul*," (*psuche*.)—1 Cor. 15: 45. Observe, it does not read, he was made an *immortal soul*. When examining the Old Testament, we found that the phrase "living soul," applied to man in Gen. 2: 7, was precisely the same that was applied to all living creatures in the first chapter of Genesis, and in various other passages. We find *psuche* in the New Testament agreeing perfectly with the use of *nephesh* in the Old Testament. "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every living *soul* (*psuche*) died in the sea."—Rev. 16: 3. In this last passage we see that every live creature in the sea is still called a "living soul," and there is no intimation in the Bible that the phrase "living soul," when applied to man, signifies an immortal being, any more than when applied to animals in the sea. As the word *soul* covers the *whole man*, who is said to be "mortal," it would seem strange if it should afterwards be used to represent an "immaterial," "uncompounded," "indivisible," "indestructible," "intangible" "immortal" man *inside* of what our Creator calls *man*, and one too of which he has given us no information whatever.

We pass to the consideration of the *second* use of *psuche* in the New Testament. This harmonizes again perfectly with the corresponding word *nephesh* in the Hebrew Scriptures. Out of the one hundred and five times, it is rendered *life* and *lives* forty times, and applied indiscriminately to man and beast; but when thus rendered, it never means an organized being, but the "animated principle."

The word *psuche* first occurs in the New Testament, in Matt. 2: 20. The angel of the Lord says to Joseph, "Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and go into the land of Israel; for they are dead which sought the young child's *life*." If *life* in this text represents an immortal conscious entity, or being, in

side of the physical organism, which would escape from imprisonment soon as the organism is killed, then all their efforts to obtain that must be like running to catch lightning. Subsequently, this same wonderful personage "laid down his *life* (*psuche*) for us, and we ought to lay down our *lives* (*psuche*) for the brethren."—1 John 3: 16. Again, he says, "I am the good shepherd; the good shepherd giveth his *life* (*psuche*) for the sheep."—John 10: 11. "I lay down my *life* (*psuche*) for the sheep."—John 10: 15. "Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my *life* (*psuche*) that I might take it again."—John 10: 17. It will be seen that the personal identity is represented by the pronoun *I*, instead of *it*, which stands for the word *life*; thus showing, most clearly, that the *organism* constitutes the *identity*, and not the *psuche* or "animated principle," which is common to all living beings on the planet.

When Paul was being carried to Rome, a very severe tempest was encountered, and all expected to find a watery grave; "but after long abstinence, Paul stood forth in the midst of them, and said, "Sirs,..... there shall be no loss of any man's *life* (*psuche*) among you, but of the ship."—Acts 27: 21, 22. Did Paul mean to teach those sailors that each had an "immortal soul," and that not one of them should go to "hell torments," when he said there should "be no loss of any man's *life*," (*psuche*)?

In speaking of Epaphroditus, Paul says, "For the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his *life* (*psuche*) to supply your lack of service toward me."—Phil. 2: 30. Does Paul mean that his brother Epaphroditus had an immortal soul which he did not regard or try to save?

"And the third part of the creatures which were in the sea, and had *life* (*psuche*) died."—Rev. 8: 9. Here the same word is applied to the creatures in the sea. We think there can be no doubt but that it means the same in the one example as the other; but in no case does it represent a conscious man existing separate from his physical organism.

Having examined the meaning of *psuche*, and found that in its *primary* use it means the *whole being*, like *nephesh*, its corresponding word in the Old Testament, and that when it is rendered *life*, it represents the "animated principle" common to all living creatures the same as in the Hebrew; we pass to notice its *third* and last sense, when it is used to indicate a *state of feeling*.

"But the unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their *minds* (*psuche*) evil affected against the brethren."—Acts 14: 2. In this case, the *feelings* of the Jews were aroused against the Gentiles. "Consider him that endureth such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your



*minds*," (*psuche*).—Hrb. 12: 3. We are here exhorted against a *feeling* of exhaustion and discouragement in the work of the Lord. When Paul is instructing servants, he says, "Not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but as the servants of Christ, doing the will of God from the *heart*," (*psuche*).—Eph. 6: 6. He would have the servant be interested, have his *feelings* enlisted, so as to engage in the work *heartily*. Paul seems to be opposed to all drowsy feeling when we are engaged in a good cause, and would have servants be watchful against such. Again he says, when writing to the same class, "And whatsoever ye do, do it *heartily* (*psuche*) as to the Lord, and not to men."—Col. 3: 23.

We think these examples show plainly the *third* use of *psuche*, when used to represent a state of *mind or feeling*.

We have not yet found any intimation of an *immortal* soul, but there are two texts that are frequently presented as evidence that the soul never dies—one in Rev. 6: 9, the other in Matt. 10: 28.

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the *souls* of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony, which they held." The two verses following read, "And they cried with a loud voice, saying, how long O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren, that should be *killed* as they were, should be fulfilled."

There are four points that should be noticed in the account.—  
1. *What* was seen? 2. *Where* seen? 3. Their *cry*. 4. Their *condition*.

1. *What was seen?* We are told by some that "it was their disembodied immortal spirits"; but the word *psuche*, here translated *soul*, is not rendered *spirit* once in the Bible. Another says, "it was their disembodied immortal *souls*." We have not yet been able to find any proof that such exist as *conscious* entities, nor any evidence that such were ever seen, or can be seen, unless it is found in this passage. The souls say, "our *blood*," but they do not speak as though their *bodies* had been *killed*, and they, the souls, had escaped unharmed. We have many examples where *rephesh*, the Hebrew word corresponding with *psuche*, is rendered *person*; and in Prof. Whiting's translation of the New Testament, *psuche* is rendered *person* in this passage. Prof. Whiting has the reputation of being one of the best Greek and Hebrew scholars in America, and is now employed in the new translation by the American Bible Union. If this be rendered *person*, it will be in harmony with the whole Bible; whereas, if we use the word *soul*, in the popular sense, we make the Scriptures contradict themselves.

2. *Where were they seen?* "Under the altar." Where was the altar? Dr. Clark, when speaking on this passage, says.-- "The altar is upon *earth*, not in heaven." It could not have been either in heaven or hell (*hades*), for they were slain neither in the one nor the other. It seems that John saw in vision the great slaughter field, where the martyrs were to be slain upon earth, and calls it "the altar," on which millions were butchered for their testimony in favor of Jesus. Let it be remembered, these souls (persons) are seen about the altar, which was upon the *earth*.

3. *Their cry.* If they were alive, it appears they were in a very uneasy and suffering condition; in which case, it must have been their cry as they were led by the thousand to the altar for slaughter; but there is another sense in which they cry. As Dr. Clark says, "Their *blood*, like that of Abel, cried for vengeance." Says the Lord to Cain, "The *voice* of thy brother's blood CRIETH unto me from the ground." It is said of Christ, that his *blood*.... *speaketh* better things than that of Abel." Thus does the blood of the martyrs cry. It should be observed that the account is clothed more or less in symbolical language, and should not be so interpreted as to contradict plain and literal Scripture, which would be the case, if this passage was made to teach that the souls of men are conscious when the men themselves are *dead*.

4. *Their condition.* They are not only "under the altar," which is upon *earth*, but they are "*killed*." It is that very part that John *saw*; that part which *cried*, that was "*killed*." This same class is mentioned again in Rev. 20: 4. "And I saw the souls (*persons*, Whiting's trans.) of them that were *beheaded* for the witness of Jesus....and they *lived* and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the *rest of the DEAD lived not again* until the thousand years were finished." This is so plain it seems to need no comment. Some of these souls, or persons, had been *beheaded*, which of course *killed* them. Then they could not reign with Christ till made *alive*; hence we read they *lived*, and 'this is the *first resurrection*.' "But the rest of the *dead* lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Why say they "*lived not*," if they were all alive in *hades*, in torment?

We think it plain that John saw in vision the martyred saints during the Papal persecutions, as they lay weltering in their blood, which, like Abel's and Christ's was a witness against their cruel tormenters. They remain in the embrace of death till the vision passes on to Rev. 20: 4, where he sees them live again and commence their reign with Christ, and are pronounced "blessed" because they have "part in the first resurrection."



We think we have now given all the uses of *nephesh* and *psuche* the Hebrew and Greek words rendered *soul* in the Old and New Testaments, but have not yet found anything about an *immortal* soul.

There is one more text that needs a passing notice—Matt. 10: 28. If we accept the popular definition of soul, this Scripture would appear quite strong; but when we let the Bible explain itself, and be in harmony with its own teachings, common sense, facts and philosophy, we think this passage is quite plain. The passage reads—"Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to *destroy both soul and body in hell.*" The same caution is given in Luke 12: 4, in the following language:—"And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which after he has *killed* hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him."

The word rendered *hell* in this passage is *gehenna*. This word originally represented "the valley of Hinnom," a place near Jerusalem, where sacrifices were offered by the Jews. It became a filthy place, and fires were kept burning to *destroy* or consume the filth there deposited. Worms assisted in devouring the carcases left there for consumption. Nothing was thrown among this mass of corruption which they wished to preserve; and when the Savior would illustrate the final, future punishment of the wicked, he refers to this *gehenna* or valley of Hinnom. Nothing could show more clearly that the wicked were not to be preserved alive eternally; for whatever was cast *alive* into the fire of *gehenna*, soon had its life destroyed. And to make the case as strong as possible and their *entire destruction* beyond all doubt, he says, the fire shall not be quenched. An unquenchable fire always *consumes* the burning object. If the fire could be quenched, a part of the burning body might be saved from the "devouring fire;" but if *unquenchable*, it must be burnt up. All beings cast into an unquenchable fire, must lose their *lives* and have their bodies destroyed.

In Matt. 10: 28, we learn that we should 'fear him which is able to DESTROY *both soul and body in hell.*' Does any one suppose that the bodies of wicked men would be *preserved* by being cast into a fire that could not be extinguished? Certainly not

But the *soul* is destroyed in this case as truly as the *body*. It reads, "destroy both." This can not mean destroy the one, and preserve the other from the effects of the fire. Fire either *purifies* or *consumes*. It is employed in purifying gold and silver, and for consuming thorns, briars, stubble and tares. The wicked are compared with the last four objects mentioned, but never with anything that would not be burned up if cast into fire.

The word rendered *soul* in this text, is rendered *life* forty times out of the one hundred and five that occur in the New Testament. We know of no reason why it may not be translated *life* in this passage as well as in any other. In one translation, the "Emphatic Diaglott," I notice it is rendered *life*. This makes the passage harmonize with the whole Bible. Is it safe to put a construction upon this text which will be in opposition to all the rest of the Scriptures? This is the only passage we can find which *seems* to teach that there is anything about man that cannot be killed by his fellow; but the question arises, what does the word *psuche* in Matt. 10: 28 represent? We think it does not mean *this* present *soul* or *life*, for the reason that the destruction threatened is not in this life, but in the world to come. Man can and does take *this* life, according to many records in the Bible. Is there any other life? "This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life."... 1 John 2: 25. Can *man* take that, or kill it? Nay, verily. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, or take this life,] and *after* that have no more that they can do." It is certain, then, that *man* cannot take from us our future life, now "hid with Christ in God."

If we should attempt to put the popular construction on Matt. 10: 28, making *soul* mean the real man, it will be seen from examination, that it overthrows the position assumed, and makes the Bible contradict itself. Let us suppose that *soul* in this passage represents the real man,—the man David if you please; and in order to make the point plain, we will put the word David in the place of *soul*, premising that David and *soul* are synonymous. Then it will read, "fear not them which kill the body but are not able to kill" David, "but rather fear him which is able to destroy both" David and his "body in hell." This makes a full destruction of the whole of David. No part escapes from the destruction.

But we return to the first clause of the verse. Admitting that *soul* and David are identical, permit Peter to say a word about this matter. "Men and brethren let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch David, that *he* is both *dead* and *buried*.... David is



not ascended into the heavens."..Acts 2: 29, 34. "For *David* after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on *sleep* and was laid to his fathers and saw corruption."..Acts 13: 36. If *soul* represents the *real man* David, then it is plain, according to the Bible, that he is both dead and buried, and is not ascended into the heavens. We think it plain that the word *soul* in Matt. 10: 28, does not represent the *man*, but the *future life*, over which man has no power. He may cut us off from this present existence, but cannot from the life to come, which is *promised* through Christ, as a gift to be received when He "who is our life shall appear."

We find the words rendered die, death, dead, &c., occur twenty-five hundred and eighty-two times in the Bible, not one of which intimates that the being is alive between death and the resurrection, unless it be the one under consideration. Is it fair to interpret this *one* so as to make it contradict twenty-five hundred and eighty-one others? We leave the reader to judge.

We will give all the passages in the New Testament where *psuche* is used and not rendered soul. It is rendered soul fifty eight times.

1. *Psuche* is rendered *life* and *lives* forty times.

'They are dead which sought the young child's *life*.'—Matt. 2: 20. 'Take no thought for your *life*, what ye shall eat, or what ye shall drink; nor yet for your body, what ye shall put on; is not the *life* more than meat, and the body than raiment?'—Matt. 6: 25. 'He that findeth his *life* shall lose it; and he that loseth his *life* for my sake, shall find it.'—Matt. 10: 39. 'For whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake, shall find it.'—Matt. 16: 25. 'The Son of man came.... to give his *life* a ransom for many.'—Matt. 20: 28. 'Is it lawful.... to save *life* or to kill?'—Mk. 3: 4. 'For whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it; but whosoever shall lose his *life* for my sake and the gospel's, the same shall save it.'—Mk. 8: 35. 'The Son of man came.... to give his *life* a ransom for many.'—Mk. 10: 45. 'Is it lawful.... to save *life*, or to destroy it?'—Lk. 6: 9. 'Whosoever will save his *life* shall lose it; but whosoever will lose his *life* for my sake, the same shall save it.'—Lk. 9: 24. 'The Son of man is not come to destroy men's *lives*, but to save them.'—Lk. 9: 56. 'Take no thought for your *life*, what ye shall eat: neither for the body, what ye shall put on. The *life* is more than meat, and the body is more than raiment.'—Lk. 12: 22, 23. 'If any man come to me, and hate not his.... own *life* also, he can not be my disciple.'—Lk. 14: 26. 'Whosoever shall seek to save his *life* shall lose it.'—Lk. 17: 33. 'The good shepherd giveth his *life* for the sheep.'—John 10: 11. 'I lay down my *life*, that I might take it again.'—John 10: 15. 'Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my *life*, that I might take it again.'—John 10: 17. 'He that loveth his *life* shall lose it; and he that hateth his

*life* in this world, shall keep it unto life eternal.'—John 12: 25. 'I will lay down my *life* for thy sake...' Jesus answered him, wilt thou lay down thy *life* for my sake?'... John 13: 37, 38. 'Greater love hath no man than this, that a man lay down his *life* for his friends.'... John 15: 13. 'Men that hazarded their *lives* for the name of our Lord Jesus Christ.'... Acts 15: 26. 'Trouble not yourselves; for his *life* is in him.'... Acts 20: 10. 'Neither count I my *life* dear unto myself.'... Acts 20: 24. 'I perceive that this voyage will be with hurt and much damage, not only of the lading and ship, but also of our *lives*.'... Acts 27: 10. 'There shall be no loss of any man's *life* among you, but of the ship.'... Acts 27: 22. 'I am left alone, and they seek my *life*.'... Rom. 11: 3. 'Who have for my *life* laid down their own necks.'... Rom. 16: 4. 'Because for the work of Christ he was nigh unto death, not regarding his *life* to supply your lack of service toward me.'... Phil. 2: 30. 'He laid down his *life* for us; and we ought to lay down our *lives* for the brethren.'... 1 John 3: 16. 'The creatures which were in the sea, and had *life*, died.'... Rev. 8: 9. 'They loved not their *lives* unto the death.'... Rev. 12: 11. *Total*, 40.

2. *Psuche* is rendered *mind* three times. 'The unbelieving Jews stirred up the Gentiles, and made their *minds* evil affected against the brethren.'... Acts 14: 2. 'Stand fast in one spirit with one *mind*.'... Phil. 1: 27. 'Consider him that endured such contradiction of sinners against himself, lest ye be wearied and faint in your *minds*.'... Heb. 12: 3.

3. *Psuche* is rendered *you* once. 'I will very gladly spend and be spent for *you*.'... 2 Cor. 12: 15.

4. *Psuche* is rendered *heart* once. 'Doing the will of God from the *heart*.'... Eph. 6: 6.

5. *Psuche* is rendered *us* once. 'How long dost thou make *us* to doubt.'... John 10: 24.

6. *Psuche* is rendered *heartily* once. 'And whatsoever ye do, do it *heartily*, as to the Lord, and not unto men.'... Col. 3: 23.

In conclusion, we would remark that, after surveying the whole Bible on this subject, in our honesty, we can come to no other decision than that the soul *nowhere* represents, in the Bible, a conscious part of man existing as such when the physical organism is sleeping in death. We are *fully* satisfied that the popular theology of the day, on this point, is sustained neither by *facts*, *true philosophy*, *common sense*, nor the BIBLE.

MILES GRANT.

Published at the "World's Crisis" office, 167  
Hanover Street, Boston, Mass,



# The Spirit in Man.

---

## WHAT IS IT?

---

“The spirit shall return unto God who gave it.”—Eccl. 12: 7.

In compliance with a request, we purpose to give the signification of the word *spirit*, as used in the Bible, examining *every* passage where the original words occur, that are thus rendered, hoping to come to a correct conclusion in the matter. We do not expect to convince the mere caviler and sectarian bigot, who thinks more of his *creed* than the *Bible*; but hope, by the help of the Lord, to throw light upon the one who is honestly seeking for the right way—“the old paths.”

There are four words in the Bible which are rendered *spirit* in our translation, to wit:—*ruach* and *n'shah-mah* in the Old Testament; *pneuma* and *phantasma* in the New. *N'shah-mah*, in the O. T., is rendered spirit twice, and *phantasma*, in the N. T., is also rendered spirit twice. All other examples in the the O. T. are from *ruach*; and in the N. T. from *pneuma*.

The word spirit is used in four senses in the Bible.

1. To represent a *being*. “God is a spirit.” Angels are “ministering spirits”; hence *one* is properly called “a spirit.” Demons, or fallen angels, are called “unclean spirits.”

2. The word spirit is used to denote an *influence* proceeding *from* a being. Hence we read of the Comforter, or Holy Spirit, that “it proceedeth *from* the Father.” In mesmeric operations there is a spirit proceeding from the operator to his subject, by means of which he controls him. All men and animals exert this influence, more or less

3. Spirit is used to represent a *state of mind*:—as, a “haughty spirit,” “proud in spirit,” etc.

4. The same word is used to denote the *atmosphere* we breathe, and is then properly denominated “the breath of life,” without which all living beings upon this planet would soon die.

Before passing to notice examples of the use of *ruach* and *pneuma*, we will refer to the other two words which are rendered *spirit*, each twice. *N'shah-mah* is found twenty-four times in the Hebrew scriptures, and is usually rendered *breath*. It is the word used in Gen. 2: 7, where it is said “The Lord God formed man of the dust of the ground, and breathed (or blew) into his nostrils the (*n'shah-mah*) *breath* of life, and *man* became a living soul.” The same word is in Isa. 2: 22 —“Cease ye from man whose (*n'shah-mah*) *breath* is in his *nostrils*.”

In Job 26: 4, we have one of the examples where this word is rendered *spirit*. In addressing Job, the Lord says: “To whom hast thou uttered words? and whose (*n'shah-mah*) *spirit* came from thee?” In this case, Job is asked if he gave “the breath of life” to any one? He might form an object resembling a living being, but had no power to give it “the breath of life”; the Creator alone has the ability to do this work.

The other example is in Prov. 20: 27. “The (*n'shah-mah*) *spirit* of man is the candle of the Lord.” When this is taken from the man, he is like a lamp blown out; all circulation stops, “his thoughts perish,” and he is of no further use in society. “His lamp” is “put out,” or, in other words, his breath is taken away.

The examples in the New Testament where *spirit* is not from *pneuma*, but *phantasma*, are in Matt. 14: 26, and Mk. 6: 49; both are records of the same event.—At one time the disciples saw Jesus “walking on the sea, they were troubled, saying, ‘it is a (*phantasma*) *spirit*.’” A phantom has the *appearance* of reality; but like a shadow, is nothing real or tangible. When a thing appears to be where it is not, or a shadow like a reality, it may be properly called a *phantom*.



In all, except the passages examined, Spirit is from *ruach* or *pneuma*.

In our endeavor to ascertain the meaning of *ruach*, we will begin with its first use, Gen. 1: 2. "And the earth was without form, and void; and darkness was upon the face of the deep. And the (*ruach*) Spirit of God (Septuagint—'a breath of God,') moved upon the face of the waters." In this example, the *Spirit* is evidently the Holy Spirit "which proceedeth from the Father." By means of this, God exerts his *power*, while he remains in heaven, "his habitation." By this Spirit, or influence, he is omnipresent, and searches all things. Man conveys power in a similar manner, when he controls his mesmeric subject at a distance; and so do the demons, when performing through their mediums; but their agent is the antagonist of God and his Spirit, and leads to destruction.

The *second* example is in Gen. 3: 8. "And the voice of the Lord God walking in the garden in the (*ruach*) *cool* (marg. *wind*) of the day." Here we have *ruach* used to represent the *air* in motion, producing the gently cooling breeze, so refreshing and pleasing in the agreeable temperature.

The *third* case is in Gen. 6: 3. "And the Lord said, 'My (*ruach*) Spirit shall not always strive with man, for that he also is flesh; yet his days shall be an hundred and twenty years.'" The Septuagint renders this passage, "My breath must not continue in these men, to this age, because they are flesh." In our translation, the word Spirit, in this example, refers to the Holy Spirit, which is employed to "reprove the world of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment." If we adopt the Septuagint rendering, it would refer to "the breath of life, which was to be taken from them at the flood."

The *fourth* example is in Gen. 6: 17. "And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all things wherein is the (*ruach*) *breath* of life, from under heaven; and everything that is in the earth shall die." In this passage, *ruach* plainly represents the breath in the nostrils of the living creatures.

*Fifth.* Gen. 7: 15. "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the (*ruach*) *breath* of life." This needs no comment.

*Sixth.* Gen. 7: 22. "All in whose nostrils was (*ruach*) the *breath* of life, of all that was in the dry land, died." From these examples, we see that this breath of life is common to *all* animals, and we here assert, it is never represented as the conscious, accountable part of man.

*Seventh.* Gen. 8: 1. "And God remembered Noah, and every living thing, and all the cattle that was with him in the ark; and God made a (*ruach*) *wind* to pass over the earth; and the waters were assuaged." Here we have *ruach* rendered wind. It is rendered thus ninety-five times.

The next passage where *ruach* occurs is in Gen. 26: 35. "Which were a grief of (*ruach*) *mind* unto Isaac and Rebekah." The marginal reading is—"bitterness of spirit." *Ruach*, in this example, is used in its third sense, and represents "a *state of feeling*." It is thus used several times.

In the next example, it is used in the same sense. Gen. 41: 8. "And it came to pass in the morning, that his (*ruach*) *spirit* was troubled; and he sent and called for all the magicians of Egypt, and all the wise men thereof; and Pharaoh told them his dream."

The next in order is in Gen. 41: 38. "And Pharaoh said unto his servants, can we find such an one as this is, a man in whom the (*ruach*) *Spirit* of God is?" This was said in reference to Joseph. *Ruach* is here used in its second sense, representing the Holy Spirit, or *influence* from God.

The last in Genesis is found in chap. 45: 27. "And they told him all the words of Joseph, which he had said unto them; and when he saw the wagons which Joseph had sent to carry him, the (*ruach*) *spirit* of Jacob their father revived." In this example, *ruach* is used in its *third* sense. It seems Jacob was in a state of feeling which is often denominated "low spirited," because his beloved son Joseph had been taken from



him in his old age; but when he became satisfied that he was *alive*, he was very much revived in his feelings, and became joyful in spirit.

In our examination, we have passed down the stream of time over twenty-three hundred years from the creation, but have found nothing that shows the spirit, or "breath of life" in man, is a conscious entity, existing as such after man returns to dust. Why this silence about an immortal, immaterial spirit, which we are told is the *real man*, if such a position is true? Suppose we could prove that this "breath of life" were a conscious being in *man*, we should prove the same thing of *beasts*, for they have all *one (ruach) breath*." We all breathe from the same airy ocean, and all die when there is not sufficient physical strength to breathe any longer. This fact is plainly expressed in Ps. 146: 4. "His (*ruach*) *breath* goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that very day his *thoughts perish*;" also, in Ps. 104: 29—"Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their (*ruach*) *breath*, they *die*, and return to their *dust*." We can find no passage of Scripture to show that anything but "the breath of life" leaves man at death; and we feel confident that physiology, reason, facts and common sense harmonize on this point, and stand out in bold relief to sustain the Bible doctrine that the *whole man* is MORTAL in this life. The word of the Lord shows us plainly how to obtain "immortality"—"by patient continuance in well doing;" and that "this mortal must *put on* immortality" when "the last . . . trumpet shall sound, and the *dead* shall be raised . . . then shall be brought to pass the saying that is written, death is swallowed up in victory."

We will now pass to notice a few more examples where the word *ruach* occurs.

The *twelfth* is in Ex. 6: 9. "Moses spake so unto the children of Israel; but they hearkened not unto Moses for anguish of (*ruach*) *spirit*, and for cruel bondage." Here is another instance where *ruach* is used to denote "a state of feeling." Solomon uses the word in the same sense when he says—"A wounded (*ruach*) *spirit* who can bear?"

*Thirteenth and fourteenth.* "And Moses stretched forth his rod over the land of Egypt, and the Lord brought an east (*ruach*) wind, upon the land all that day, and all that night; and when it was morning, the east (*ruach*) wind brought the locusts."—Ex. 10:13.

*Fifteenth.* "And the Lord turned a mighty strong west (*ruach*) wind, which took away the locusts, and cast them into the Red sea."—Ex. 10:19. It is perfectly evident that *ruach*, in these last examples, does not refer to "a state of feeling," the Holy Spirit, or an organized conscious being; but the *atmosphere* surrounding the earth, which is denominated "the breath of life." *Wind* is this air in motion. It is material, but not a conscious, moral being, responsible for its acts, any more than the waters of the ocean which are moved by its powers.

*Sixteenth.* "Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; and the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east (*ruach*) wind all that night, and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided."—Ex. 14:21.

How absurd the idea that the *ruach*, spirit, or "breath of life," which is in our "nostrils," is *ourselves*, our accountability, which goes off to get our reward, while *we* are left to be buried in the earth and sleep till "the last trumpet....shall sound" to awake "the dead." It is a mystery to us how Satan has kept this fable so long from detection, and caused so many to believe that the spirit is immortal; but we will thank the Lord for the light now shining upon the Holy Scriptures, and pray him to diffuse it throughout all christendom. It is now leaping all barriers, and already some bitter opposers act as though they were smitten with blindness, like "Saul of Tarsus," when on his way to Damascus to imprison and torment the children of the Lord. They know not what to do, or which way to turn. They are like a ship on a stormy sea, with compass lost and helm torn away. The great moral pirate—Spiritualism—is bearing down upon them with well-directed aim, and soon the dark flag of demons will be run up her mast, and she taken in tow to the whirlpool



of destruction, unless they take "the sword of the spirit, which is the word of God," and meet these enemies of Christ with lion boldness, and dove-like meekness, in the name of Jesus of Nazareth, and hurl the bomb of truth into their magazine of error, scattering it to the four winds, and exploding its very foundation, which rests on the *lie* of their noted leader, and is inscribed on their black piratical banner—"Ye shall not surely die." We see no reason to hope for the escape of the mass of professors of religion from these robbers of God, unless they at once clothe themselves with the whole armor of truth, and abandon forever the dogma of the devil, that the *ruach*, or spirit in man is immortal, and exists as the accountable being, called man, when his physical organism is mouldering in the tomb.

Having noticed the first sixteen examples where the word *ruach* occurs, but found no proof that, when it is applied to man, it means anything conscious after death, we pass to notice some promiscuous examples. "Then their (*ruach*) anger was abated toward him."—Jud. 8: 3. In this example, *ruach* is used to represent a state of feeling. The same is true of the following from 1 Sam. 1: 15. "And Hannah answered and said----I am a woman of sorrowful (*ruach*) spirit."

"And there came forth a (*ruach*) spirit and stood before the Lord, and said, I will persuade him. And the Lord said unto him, wherewith? And he said I will go forth, and I will be a lying (*ruach*) spirit in the mouth of all his prophets."—1 Kings 22: 21, 22. In this example we have *ruach* used to represent a wicked being, "unclean spirit," "demon," or evil angel. This "lying (*ruach*) spirit" proposes to deceive the prophets of Ahab, and is permitted to undertake the work, to accomplish the destruction of that wicked king. We believe similar beings are trying now to lead our race from truth to error, by means of what is known as "Spiritualism." These beings exert an influence like that of a good mesmerizer, and control their mediums by a similar influence, using them as agents to express their sentiments. Persons who had submitted to be influenced by one of

these, were said to have "a familiar spirit." These familiar spirits are all *lying* ones, and hence those who leave the Lord and his truth and consult them for information, "are an *abomination* unto the Lord." As Paul says, "they received not the love of the truth that they might be saved. And for this cause God shall send them strong delusion, that they should believe a lie." They are left in this deplorable condition because they choose lies rather than truth.

We have now noticed examples of the four general uses of the word *ruach*.

1. An intelligent being.
2. An influence proceeding from a being.
3. A state of mind or feeling.
4. The atmosphere or breath of life.

This word is rendered in twenty-two different ways, which we shall notice in due time, giving all the examples in the Bible.

We will now consider our text,—“Then shall the dust return to the earth as it was; and the(*ruach*) spirit shall return to God who gave it.” Eccl. 12: 7. This passage is very often quoted to prove that the real *man* does not die. Let us look at this point, seeking wisdom from the unerring word of truth. How much of man is included in the expression, “Then shall the *dust* return to the earth as it was?” We can settle this question, we think, by referring to man’s creation, as recorded in Gen. 2: 7. “And the Lord God formed *man* of the *dust* of the ground.” This is a plain statement, easy to be comprehended. Shall we dispute the record and say man was not formed of *dust*, but only the *house* in which he was to live? Why not believe the Lord? He says *man* was formed “of the dust of the ground.” When man is analyzed, he is found composed of carbon, oxygen, hydrogen, nitrogen, sulphur, phosphorus, iron and lime. These are all earthy substances, and when he created man from these materials, he made the most wonderful piece of mechanism of which we have any conception. The lungs, with their million of air cells, were prepared, in connection with the air, to purify the



blood that had passed through the system, and fit it for another revolution. The atmosphere, "or breath of life," is a material substance made to move the wonderful machinery of the being called *man*. When that is taken from him, the whole machinery stops as certainly as the wheel, when the water is removed; or the engine, when the steam is taken away; but the water, or steam, is of no use without the machinery, nor the machinery without the water or steam; so the atmosphere is of no use to a dead man, and a man is of no service without "the breath of life." Says David, "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their (*ruach*) breath, they die, and return to their dust." Ps. 104: 29. This passage explains death in such a simple manner, it seems all could understand it. The word rendered *breath* in Ps. 104: 29, is the same that is translated *spirit* in our text. Does any one suppose that the *breath*, taken away from man at death, is the real accountable being? The idea seems absurd. It is not a conscious agent, but is *essential* to sustain life in this world. We come back to the question, "How much of man is included in the expression, 'then shall the *dust* return to the earth as it was?'" Why, of course, all that was *made* of *dust*. Certainly. Well, the record does not say a *part* of man was made of dust, or that a "prison" was made of dust to put a man into, but MAN, the WHOLE MAN was made of dust; then it follows as a sequence, when the *dust* returns "to the earth as it was," the *whole man* has returned to dust. When we take this position, Gen. 3: 19 is plain. "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, till thou return to the ground; for out of it was thou taken; for *dust thou art*, and unto *dust* shalt thou return." This explains also Is. 26: 19. "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in *dust*; for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the *dead*." "Marvel not at this," said Jesus; "for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth." John 5: 28. We find no intimation that any part of man is conscious when "the breath of life" has left him.

We now inquire, what leaves man at death? or what is meant by the expression, "the (*ruach*) spirit (or breath) shall return to God who gave it?" It cannot be the *man*, for he has returned to *dust*, and he cannot return to two opposite places at once. What was added to the man?—The breath of life. What, then, is there to take away to cause certain death? This breath which is in his nostrils. Says David in Ps. 146 : 4, "His (*ruach*) breath goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his *thoughts perish*." How plain and positive.

We have yet to learn that there is a single passage of Scripture to contradict the position we have taken. As it takes this wonderful organism and "the breath of life" to constitute a *living man*, it remains to be shown by our opponents, that when the breath is taken away, and this organism has returned to *dust*, that the *man* is still alive in heaven or hell.

We have now looked at examples of the four uses of *ruach*, or spirit, but do not yet find anything in the Bible about an *immortal* spirit in man. Why this entire silence on this point if it is true?

We will notice one or two passages which, at first sight, might appear to some to favor the popular theology. "When he had drunk, his (*ruach*) spirit came again, and he revived."—Jud. 15: 19. This is recorded of Sampson when "he was sore athirst" and feared death for want of water. This took place while he was *alive*, but when very much exhausted. The spirit cannot mean the immortal one of which we hear so much, for if that had left, then Sampson was *dead*; besides we doubt whether such a spirit would leave for want of *water*, and then come back to live in the man again because he obtained some drink. The obvious idea is, that by drinking the water, he was refreshed;—spirit being used in this example to represent a state of *feeling*. His nervous and mental energies were prostrated, but were aroused and revived when his "sore" thirst was quenched. A similar example is recorded in 1 Sam. 30: 12.—The Amalekites had smitten Ziklag, burned it with fire,



and taken the women captives. While David was engaged in their pursuit, his men found an Egyptian, who had been a servant to an Amalekite. This servant had been left by the way, on account of sickness. He was in a very exhausted condition when brought to David. They "gave him bread, and he did eat; and they made him drink water. And they gave him a piece of a cake of figs, and two clusters of raisins; and when he had eaten, his (*ruach*) spirit came again to him, for he had eaten no bread, nor drunk any water, three days and three nights." In this example, it is evident that *ruach* does not represent a conscious entity that had left the man, which came back when they gave him food and drink, for the man was not dead. When a man is exhausted and depressed in his feelings, we say he is "low-spirited;" and of another who is very energetic, "he is high-spirited," or "full of spirit," meaning life—animation. When *ruach* is used as in the foregoing examples, it may be properly rendered by the word *courage*, or animation, as in Joshua 2: 11. Rahab says to the spies, whom she protected, "as soon as we heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more (*ruach*) courage in any man, because of you." This cannot mean that their immortal spirits were so frightened that they all left their habitations in the bodies of the men and women who lived in Jericho, and flew away for safety. Those men lived on, but their (*ruach*) courage failed through fear of the children of the Lord.

As the atmosphere—"the (*ruach*) breath of lives"—is employed to convey the odor of flowers and other objects to the olfactory nerve, thereby producing the sensation of smell, we have the word *ruach* used several times to express *this feeling*. In speaking of the holy perfumery, prepared by the Lord's direction for the use of the tabernacle, he says:—"Whosoever shall make like unto that, (*ruach*) to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from his people." Ex. 30: 38. In this example the word is used in the infinitive and active form. As "the breath of lives, or atmosphere, is ever in motion, the

Lord has seen fit to use the word *ruach*, when representing the *air*, to express one *result* of its action; to wit, the sensation of *smell*. When speaking of the gods of the heathen, Moses says;—"which neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor (*ruach*) *smell*."—Deut. 4: 28. They have no nerves of sensation to be affected by the action of the atmosphere, hence, cannot smell the odor which it may bear from surrounding objects. In these examples, the word denoting the *cause* is used to represent the *effect*. *Ruach* is used in this sense eleven times.

When speaking of the scales of the Leviathan, Job says: "One is so near to another that no (*ruach*) *air* can come between them."—Job 41: 16. In this example we have *ruach* used to represent that which is called "the (*ruach*) *breath* of life," which is essential to sustain the lives of all creatures upon the earth. When taken away, we *die*, and turn to dust, to await the resurrection at the last day, when the literal man will live again.

The following passage is thought, by some, to stand opposed to our position. "And they fell upon their faces, and said, O God, the God of the (*ruach*) *spirits* of all flesh."—Num. 16: 22. It will be observed that "*all flesh*" has a portion of this spirit or breath of life. All the animal creation have received the breath or spirit of life from the Creator; hence he is "the God of the spirits" or breath "of all flesh." Job says: "The (*ruach*) *spirit* of God is in my nostrils."—Job 27: 3. We do not think Job's *mind* was in his nostrils; neither his immortal soul, if he had one. But the breath of life was there. It is absurd to suppose that the real, accountable being, called Job, was in his own nostrils. In chap. 32: 8, Job says: "But there is a (*ruach*) *spirit* in man; and the inspiration of the Almighty giveth them understanding." Observe, he does not say this spirit *is* man, but *is in* man; and without this, we have no life, no understanding. This inspiration sets the human machinery in motion, and thought is evolved by the action of the brain; till "his (*ruach*) *breath* goeth forth, ---- in that very day his thoughts perish."—Ps. 146: 4.

There is one more passage which is sometimes pro-



duced by those who believe that the (*ruach*) *spirit* is the immortal, conscious part of man. It is in Zech. 12: 1. "The burden of the word of the Lord for Israel, which stretcheth forth the heavens, and layeth the foundation of the earth and formeth the (*ruach*) *spirit* of man within him." In this scripture the Lord makes himself known as the creator of "the heavens," "the earth," and "the spirit," or breath of life" to sustain man's existence, and which he has within him, and when it is taken *from* him, he dies, and "his thoughts perish."

We have a similar passage in Amos 4: 13. "For, lo, he that *formeth* the mountains, and createth the (*ruach*) *wind* . . . the Lord, the God of Hosts is his name."—Here we have the true idea plainly expressed. The *ruach*, spirit or breath in man, is not a part of God, as many claim, but a substance *formed* by our Creator, to be received *within* ourselves, through the nostrils, for the purpose of purifying the blood while passing through the lungs and then returning through our nostrils, laden with impurities, to be exchanged for another portion of pure *ruach*, or air. The Lord *formed* this *before* he made man, but man lives no longer than this "breath of life" is "*within* him."

We have yet to learn from the Bible, philosophy, facts or physiology, that any thing but "the breath of life," was added to man after his creation, or taken from him at death.

We have aimed to notice the strongest examples that are brought from the Old Testament in favor of the popular view of the Spirit, but we have found nothing yet, which, to our mind, affords any proof that "the (*ruach*) breath of life," which was breathed into *man's* nostrils, is different from "the breath of life" in the animal creation; but we do find the wise man declaring, when speaking of man and beast, that "they have *all one* (*ruach*) *breath*."—Eccl. 3: 19. This point, then, must be considered as settled, till some proof can be brought to the contrary; and when that is done, an error would be proved in the Bible. We have no fears of success on the part of the opponent. We think, when this subject

is carefully and prayerfully examined from a *Bible* standpoint, instead of that of the *creeds*, letting the Lord "reason" with us as intelligent, common sense individuals, who have come out from behind the papal veil, and the misty fogbank of spiritualism, that the whole subject will be perfectly clear, and easy of comprehension.

We will notice a few more examples, showing the use of the word *ruach*. When Ahab, King of Israel, failed in his first attempt to get the vineyard of Naboth, he felt quite sad, and his wife Jezebel "came to him and said unto him, why is thy (*ruach*) spirit so sad, that thou eatest no bread?"—1 Kings 21:5. Ahab was in a state of *feeling* corresponding with one who is said to be "low spirited."

In 2 Chron. 21:16, we read, "The Lord stirred up against Jehoram the (*ruach*) spirit of the Philistines, and of the Arabians, that were near the Ethiopians." In this example *ruach* is used to represent the *feeling* of these nations toward Jehoram. Again, in chapter 36:22, it is said:—"The Lord stirred up the (*ruach*) spirit of Cyrus, King of Persia, that he made a proclamation throughout his kingdom and put it also in writing." Here we have *ruach* used to represent a state of *feeling*, as before. If this spirit is the *real man*, why should it *invariably* be represented by the neuter pronoun *it*? If the material organism, made "of the dust of the ground," is only a *house* in which the real man lives, and which is not the accountable being, this should always be denoted by the pronoun *it*; and the spirit, by the words *he, him, his*, etc.

Says Solomon:—"A man's pride shall bring him low; but honor shall uphold the humble in (*ruach*) spirit."—Prov. 29:23. In this example *ruach* is also used to represent a state of *feeling*, as well as in the following;—"The Lord hath poured out upon you the (*ruach*) spirit of deep sleep, and hath closed your eyes."—Is. 29:10. We need not pursue this point further, to give more examples where *ruach* represents a state of *feeling*. We see no chance of doubt that this is one of its significations.



Let us examine one or two more examples where *ruach* is used to denote the *atmosphere*, or "breath of life." "Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible (*ruach*) tempest."—Ps. 11: 6. In this case, the air is moved with such violence as to form an "horrible tempest." In speaking of the scattering of the children of Israel, the Lord declares:—"I have spread you abroad as the four (*ruach*) winds of the heaven, saith the Lord."—Zech. 2: 6. When speaking of Alexander's kingdom, Daniel says:—"His kingdom shall be divided toward the four (*ruach*) winds of heaven."—Dan. 11: 4. Says the prophet Ezekiel:—"I looked and behold, a whirl- (*ruach*) wind came out of the north, a great cloud."—Ezk. 1: 4. These examples are too plain to need comment. Many more might be given, if it were necessary, to show that *ruach* is very commonly used to denote the atmosphere we breathe, when it is called the spirit or "breath of life," without which, we die at once, and return to dust, to await the resurrection at the last day.

• We purpose now to give a classification of the examples where *ruach* is rendered by any other word than *spirit*.

The word occurs in the Hebrew text four hundred times, and is rendered *spirit* two hundred and forty times. The word is rendered in twenty-two different ways.

1. *Ruach* is rendered *blast* four times.

"With the *blast* of thy nostrils the waters were gathered."—Ex. 15: 8. "I will send a *blast* upon him, and he shall hear a rumor and shall return to his own land."—2 Kin. 19: 7. "Thou hast been a strength to the poor.... when the *blast* of the terrible ones is as a storm against the wall."—Isa. 25: 4. "I will send a *blast* upon him; and he shall hear a rumor and return to his own land."—Isa. 37: 7.

2. *Ruach* is rendered *quarters* once.

"In four *quarters* were the porters, toward the east, west, north and south."—1 Chron. 9: 24.

3. *Ruach* is rendered *anger* once.

"Their *anger* was abated towards him, when he said that."—Judges 8: 3.

4. *Ruach* is rendered *mind* six times.

"Which were a grief of *mind* unto Isaac and Rebekah."—Gen. 25: 35. "A fool uttereth all his *mind*; but a wise man keepeth it in till afterwards.—Prov. 29: 11. "I know the things that come into your *mind*, every one of them."—Ezk. 11: 5. "That which cometh into your *mind*."—Ezk. 20: 32. "When his heart was lifted up, and his *mind* hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne."—Dan. 5: 20. "Then shall his *mind* change, and he shall pass over."—Hab. 1: 11.

5. *Ruach* is rendered *courage* once.

"As soon as we heard these things, our hearts did melt, neither did there remain any more *courage* in any man."—Josh. 2: 11.

6. *Ruach* is rendered *vain* once.

"Shall *vain* words have an end?"—Job. 16: 3

7. *Ruach* is rendered *side* six times.

"And there were ninety and six pomegranates on a *side*."—Jer. 52: 23.—"He measured the east *side* with the measuring reed, five hundred reeds."—Ezk. 42: 16. He measured the north *side* five hundred reeds."—Ver. 17. "He measured the south *side* five hundred reeds."—Ver. 18. "He turned about to the west *side*, and measured five hundred reeds."—Ver. 19. "He measured it by the four *sides*."—Ver. 20.

8. *Ruach* is rendered *breath* twenty-eight times. "And, behold, I, even I, do bring a flood of waters upon the earth, to destroy all flesh wherein is the *breath* of life, from under heaven; and every thing that is in the earth shall die."—Gen. 6: 17. "And they went in unto Noah into the ark, two and two of all flesh, wherein is the *breath* of life."—Gen. 7: 15. "All in whose nostrils was the *breath* of life, of all that was in the dry land died."—Gen. 7: 22. "The blast of the *breath* of his nostrils."—2 Sam. 22: 16. "By the *breath* of his nostrils are they consumed."—Job 4: 9. "He will not suffer me to take my *breath*, but filleth me with bitterness."—Job 9: 18. "In whose hand is the soul of every living thing, and the *breath* of all mankind."—Job 12: 10. "The flame shall dry up his branches, and by the *breath* of his mouth shall he go away."—Job 15: 30. "My *breath* is corrupt."—Job 17: 1. "My *breath* is strange to my wife, though I entreated for the children's sake."—Job 19: 17. "The blast of the *breath* of thy nostrils."—Ps. 18: 15. "By the word of the Lord were the heavens made, and all the host of them by the *breath* of his mouth."—Ps. 33: 6. "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their *breath*, they die, and return to their dust."—Ps. 104: 29. "They have ears, but they hear not; neither is there any *breath* in their mouth."—Ps. 135: 17. "His *breath* goeth forth, he returneth to his earth; in that very day his thoughts perish."—Ps. 146: 4. "That which befalleth the sons of men befalleth beasts; even one thing befalleth them; as the one dieth so dieth the other; yea, they have all one *breath*."—Ecc. 3: 19. "He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, and with the *breath* of his lips shall he slay the wicked."



—Isa. 11 : 4. "And his *breath* as an overflowing stream shall reach to the midst of the neck, to sift the nations with the seive of vanity." .. Isa. 30 : 28. "Ye shall bring forth stubble ; your *breath*, as fire, shall devour you." .. Isa. 33 : 11. His molten image is falsehood and there is no *breath* in them." .. Jer. 10 : 14. "His molten image is falsehood, and there is no *breath* in them." .. Jer 51 : 17. "The *breath* of our nostrils." .. Lam. 4 : 20. "Thus saith the Lord God unto these bones, behold, "I will cause *breath* to enter into you and ye shall live." .. Ezk. 37 : 5. "And I will lay sinews upon you, and will bring up flesh upon you, and cover you with skin, and put *breath* in you, and ye shall live." .. Ezk. 37 : 6 "There was no *breath* in them." .. Ezk. 37 : 8. "Come from the four winds, oh *breath*, and breathe upon these slain, that they may live." .. Ezk. 37 ; 9. "So I prophesied as he commanded me and the *breath* came into them, and they lived." .. Ezk. 37 : 10. "Behold, it is laid over with gold and silver, and there is no *breath* at all in the midst of it." .. Hab. 2 : 19.

9. *Ruach* is rendered in the *cool* once.

"And they heard the voice of the Lord God, walking in the garden in the *cool* of the day." .. Gen. 3 : 8.

10. *Ruach* is rendered *tempest* once.

"Upon the wicked he shall rain snares, fire and brimstone, and an horrible "*tempest*." .. Ps. 11 : 6.

11. *Ruach* is rendered *spiritual* once.

"The prophet is a fool, the *spiritual* man is mad, for the multitude of thine iniquity and the great hatred." .. Hosea 9 : 7.

12. *Ruach* is rendered *air* once.

"One is so near to another, that no *air* can come between them." .. Job 41 : 16.

13. *Ruach* is rendered *windy* once.

"I would hasten my escape from the *windy* storm and tempest." .. Ps. 55 : 8.

14. *Ruach* is rendered *whirlwind* once.

"Behold, a *whirlwind* came out of the north." .. Ezk. 1 : 4.

15. *Ruach* is rendered *smell* five times.

"Whosoever shall make like unto that, to *smell* thereto, shall even be cut off from his people." .. Ex. 30 : 33. "I will not *smell* the savor of your sweet odors." .. Lev. 26 : 31. "Neither see, nor hear, nor eat, nor *smell*." Deut. 4 : 23. "They have ears, but they hear not ; noses have they, but they *smell* not." .. Ps. 115 : 6 "I despise your feast days, and I will not *smell* in your solemn assemblies " .. Amos 5 : 21.

16. *Ruach* is rendered *smelleth* once.

"He saith among the trumpets, ha, ha ; and he *smelleth* the battle afar off." .. Job 39 : 25.

17. *Ruach* is rendered *smelled* twice.

"And the Lord *smelled* a sweet savor... Gen. 8 : 21. "He *smelled* the.... raiment." .. Gen. 27 : 27.

18. *Ruach* is rendered *understanding* once.

"And shall make him of quick *understanding* in the fear of the Lord."..Isa. 11: 3.

19. *Ruach* is rendered *accept* once.

"If the Lord have stirred thee up against me, let him *accept* an offering."..1 Sam. 26: 19.

20. *Ruach* is rendered *toucheth* once.

"He brake the withs, as a thread of tow is broken when it *toucheth* the fire."..Jud. 16: 9.

21. *Ruach* is rendered *wind* ninety-five times.

"And God made a *wind* to pass over the earth."..Gen. 8: 1. "The Lord brought an east *wind* upon the land all that day, and all that night, and when it was morning, the east *wind* brought the locusts."..Ex. 10: 13. "And the Lord turned a mighty strong west *wind*, which took away the locusts."..Ex. 10: 19. "And the Lord caused the sea to go back by a strong east *wind* all that night."..Ex. 14: 21. "Thou didst blow with thy *wind*, the sea covered them."..Ex. 15: 10. "And there went forth a *wind* from the Lord."..Num. 11: 31. "He rode upon a cherub, and did fly; and he was seen upon the wings of the *wind*."..2 Sam. 22: 11. "The heaven was black with clouds and *wind*, and there was a great rain."..1 Kin. 18: 45. "A great and strong *wind* rent the mountains, and break in pieces the rocks before the Lord; but the Lord was not in the *wind*; and after the *wind* an earthquake."..1 Kin. 19: 11. Ye shall not see *wind*, neither shall ye see rain."—2 Kin. 3: 17. "Behold there came a great *wind* from the wilderness, and smote the four corners of the house."..Job 1: 19. "Do ye imagine to reprove words, and the speeches of one that is desperate, which are as *wind*?"..Job 6: 26. "O remember that my life is *wind*."..Job 7: 7. "How long shall the words of thy mouth be like a strong *wind*?"..Job 8: 2. "The east *wind*."..Job 15: 2. "They are as stubble before the *wind*."..Job 21: 18. "Make the weight for the *winds*: and he weigheth the waters by measure."..Job 28: 25. "Terrors are turned upon me; they pursue my soul as the *wind*."..Job 30: 15. "Thou liftest me up to the *wind*; thou causeth me to ride upon it."..Job 30: 22. "The *wind* passeth, and cleanseth them."..Job 37: 21. "The chaff which the *wind* driveth away."..Ps. 1: 4. "He did fly upon the wings of the *wind*."..Ps. 18: 10. "The dust before the *wind*."..Ps. 18: 42. "Let them be as chaff before the *wind*."..Ps. 35: 5. "Thou breakest the ships of Tarshish with an east *wind*."..Ps. 48: 7. "A *wind* that passeth away."..Ps. 78: 39. "As the stubble before the *wind*."..Ps. 83: 13. "The *wind* passeth over it, and it is gone."..Ps. 103: 16. "Who walketh upon the wings of the *wind*."..Ps. 104: 3. "He commandeth, and raiseth the stormy *wind*."..Ps. 107: 25. "He bringeth the *wind* out of his treasures."..Ps. 135: 7. "He causeth his *wind* to blow, and the waters flow."..Ps. 147: 18. "Stormy *wind* fulfilling his word."..Ps. 148: 8.

"He that troubleth his own house shall inherit the *wind*."..Prov. 11: 29. "Whoso boasteth himself of a false gift is like clouds and



*wind* without rain."..Prov. 25: 14. "The north *wind* driveth away rain."..Prov. 25: 23. "Whosoever hideth her, hideth the *wind*."..Prov. 27: 16. "Who hath gathered the *wind* in his fists?"..Prov. 30: 4. "The *wind* goeth toward the south, and turneth about unto the north; it whirleth about continually; and the *wind* returneth again according to his circuits."..Eccl. 1: 6. "What profit hath he that hath labored for the *wind*?"..Eccl. 5: 16. "He that observeth the *wind* shall not sow."..Eccl. 11: 4. "As the trees of the wood are moved by the *wind*."..Isa. 7: 2. "With his mighty *wind* shall he shake his hand over the river."..Isa. 11: 15. "The nations shall rush like the rushing of many waters: but God shall rebuke them, and they shall flee far off, and shall be chased as the chaff of the mountains before the *wind*."..Isa. 17: 13. "We have as it were brought forth *wind*."..Isa. 26: 18. "He stayeth his rough *wind*."..Isa. 27: 8. "A man shall be as an hiding place from the *wind*."..Isa. 32: 2. "The *wind* shall carry them away."..Isa. 41: 16. "Their molten images are *wind* and confusion."..Isa. 41: 29. "The *wind* shall carry them all away."..Isa. 57: 13. "Our iniquities, like the *wind*, have taken us away."..Isa. 64: 6. "Snuffeth up the *wind* at her pleasure."..Jer. 2: 24. "A dry *wind*.... even a full *wind* from those places shall come unto me,"..Jer. 4: 11, 12. "The prophets shall become *wind*, and the word is not in them."..Jer. 5: 13. "He maketh the lightnings with rain, and bringeth forth the *wind* out of his treasures."..Jer. 10: 13. "Therefore will I scatter them as the stubble that passeth away by the *wind*."..Jer. 13: 24. "They snuffed up the *wind* like dragons."..Jer. 14: 6. "I will scatter them as with an east *wind*."..Jer. 18: 17. "The *wind* shall eat up all thy pastors."..Jer. 22: 22. "I will scatter into all *winds* them that are in the utmost corners."..Jer. 49: 32. "Upon Elam will I bring the four *winds* from the four quarters of heaven, and will scatter them towards all those *winds*."..Jer. 49: 36. "I will raise up against Babylon.... a destroying *wind*."..Jer. 51: 1. "He....bringeth forth the *wind* out of his treasures."..Jer. 51: 16.

"A third part thou shalt scatter in the *wind*."..Ezk. 5: 2. "The whole remnant of thee will I scatter in all the *winds*."..Ezk. 5: 10. "I will scatter a third part into all the *winds*."..Ezk. 5: 12. "I will scatter toward every *wind* all that are about him."..Ezk. 12: 14. "A stormy *wind* shall rend it."..Ezk. 13: 11. "I will even rend it with a stormy *wind* in my fury."..Ezk. 13: 13. "Shall it not utterly wither when the east *wind* toucheth it?"..Ezk. 17: 10. "They that remain shall be scattered toward all *winds*."..Ezk. 17: 21. "The east *wind* dried up her fruit."..Ezk. 19: 12. "The east *wind* hath broken thee in the midst of the seas."..Ezk. 27: 26. "Prophecy unto the *wind*, prophecy, son of man, and say to the *wind*, thus saith the Lord God, come from the four *winds*, O breath."..Ezk. 37: 9. "The *wind* carried them away."..Dan. 2: 35. "The four *winds* of the heaven strove upon the great sea."..Dan. 7: 2. "For it came up four notable ones, toward the four *winds* of heaven."..Dan. 8: 8. "His kingdom shall be broken and shall be divi-

ded toward the four *winds* of heaven."..Dan. 11: 4. "The *wind* liath bound her up in her wings."..Hosea 4: 19. "They have sown the *wind*."..Hosea 8: 7. "Ephraim feedeth on *wind*."..Hosea 12: 1. "The *wind* of the Lord shall come."..Hosea 13: 15. "He that formeth the mountains and createth the *wind*."..Amos 4: 13. "The Lord sent out a great *wind* into the sea."..Jonah 1: 4. "God prepared a vehement east *wind*."..Jonah 4: 8. "The four *winds* of the heaven."..Zech. 2: 6. "The *wind* was in their wings."..Zech. 5: 9... *Total 95*

We have now examined the various renderings and meanings of the word rendered *spirit* in the Old Testament, and submit them for the consideration of the candid reader. If we have succeeded in leading any to a better understanding of the Scriptures and an increased interest in their study, with love for the truth, we would praise the Lord for the privilege; and, although some honest and even good men may shun our society and consider us heretics, we would still thank the Lord that we are counted worthy to suffer for the truth's sake. We have no misgivings in relation to the truth of the points taken, and hence can afford to bear scorn and reproachful epithets with a smile, while the peace of God rules within the heart.

In all the Old Testament, we have found nothing to teach us that *man* has an immortal spirit that will be conscious when *he* is *dead*. Why are we called *infidel* for rejecting what we cannot find taught in the Bible? We have not yet found a single verse that teaches the *conscious* existence of any *part* of man after "the breath of life" has returned to God, who gave it; but we *have* found it most plainly and positively declared, that, when man's (*ruach*) "*breath* goeth forth, *he* returneth to the earth; in that very day *his thoughts* PERISH."

#### PNEUMA.

Having examined the word *spirit* in the Old Testament, and found no proof that anything leaves man at death but "the breath of life," which is essential to sustain man's *conscious* existence, but is not of *itself* the conscious part; we now pass to the examination of *pneuma*, the corresponding word in the New Testament.

*Pneuma* is from *pneo*, "to blow, breathe, of the wind and air." 2. "To breathe, send forth an odor," "to breathe or smell of a thing." 3. "Of animals, to breathe hard, pant, gasp." 4. "Generally, to draw breath, breathe, and so to live."—*Liddell & Scott*.



*Pneuma* is defined as follows:—"Wind," "air," "the air we breathe," "the breath of life," "the Spirit," "a living being," "spirit, i. e. feeling."—*Lid. & Scott.*

*Pneuma*, like *ruach* in the Old Testament, has *four* significations.

1. It represents, primarily, the *air* we breathe.
2. It denotes a *being*, as angels.
3. It represents an *influence* from a being.
4. It indicates a *state of feeling*.

*Pneuma* is the only word rendered spirit in the New Testament, with two exceptions—Matt. 14: 26; Mk. 6: 49.—For an examination of these two passages, see p. 2.

We would here remark that *pneuma* is not once rendered *soul*. The word occurs in the Greek text three hundred and eighty-five times. In order that we may understand the uses of the word, we will examine all the passages in the gospel by St. Matthew which contain the word *pneuma*.—The *first* is in Matt. 1: 18, where we have an account of the birth of Christ. When speaking of Mary, the mother of Jesus, he says:—"She was found with child of the Holy (*pneuma*) Ghost." "Holy Ghost" and "Holy Spirit" are synonymous, and in our examination we shall adopt the latter expression. In this first use of the word, *pneuma* represents the holy *influence* "which proceedeth from the Father." As this influence is the agent employed by our Heavenly Father to accomplish his purposes, it is represented by a pronoun in the masculine gender. By means of this influence, God is omnipresent, while his personality is in heaven, accompanied by our Savior, who is "the *express image* of his *person*."—Heb. 1: 3. By means of this influence or holy *pneuma*, he dwells in all his children, and exerts his power in all parts of our world at the same time. David says:—"Whither shall I go from thy (*ruach*) spirit?" intimating that he could not hide from its influence, "for the (*pneuma*) *spirit* searcheth all things."—1 Cor. 2: 10. We see no reason why this influence, by means of which God exerts his power, should not be represented by the masculine pronoun, as well as *wisdom* by the feminine. Of the latter it is said:—"Wisdom hath builded *her* house, *she* hath hewn out *her* seven pillars." Like wisdom, the Holy Spirit

is often personified to represent the presence and acts of our Heavenly Father, from whom this agent proceeds.

The *second* time the word *pneuma* occurs is in Matt. 1: 20. The angel said to Joseph, when speaking of his espoused wife, "That which is conceived in her is of the Holy (*pneuma*) Spirit." As the Savior was begotten by the Holy Spirit, he in this partook of the Divine nature, and as he was born of the Virgin Mary, he also partook of human nature, and thus became a *mediator* between God and man. These two natures are blended in *one being*, who is denominated "the Son of God" and "the Son of man"—our Savior.

The *third* passage in order, where *pneuma* is found, is in Matt. 3: 11. "He shall baptize you with the Holy Spirit." Wakefield renders this, "in a *holy wind*." When describing the event, the apostle says, "And suddenly there came a sound from heaven, as of a rushing mighty *wind*, and it filled all the house where they were sitting."—Acts 2: 2. As the house was *filled* with this holy wind or *Spirit*, the disciples were immersed or baptized in it. We must be immersed in the element employed, otherwise, baptism is impossible.

*Fourth.* "And Jesus, when he was baptized, went up straightway out of the water; and lo, the heavens were opened unto him, and he saw the (*pneuma*) Spirit of God descending like a dove, and lighting upon him.—Matt. 3: 16. On this extraordinary occasion, the Holy Spirit was visible. Electricity and magnetism may be so concentrated as to be seen, but such is not their ordinary appearance. So at Christ's baptism, the Holy Spirit was manifested as never before; at least, we have no record of such a manifestation before or since. This was the special sign to John by which he was to know the Son of God.

*Fifth.* "Then was Jesus led up of the (*pneuma*) *spirit* into the wilderness, to be tempted of the devil."—Matt. 4: 1. The spirit in this example is the same influence mentioned in the passage already examined.

*Sixth.* "Blessed are the poor in (*pneuma*) *spirit*.—Matt. 5: 3. We are satisfied, at a glance, that *pneuma* in this text does not refer to the Holy Spirit, for those are not



blessed who are poor in this, or nearly destitute of its influence. *Pneuma* in this example is used to denote "a state of feeling"—such a state as is pleasing to the Lord—one opposed to arrogance and pride. Says the Lord by his prophet Isaiah:—"To this man will I look, even to him that is poor and of a contrite (*ruach*) spirit, and trembleth at my word." Says the Psalmist, "The Lord is nigh unto them that are of a broken heart, and saveth such as be of a contrite (*ruach*) spirit." *Pneuma* is used to represent "a state of feeling" sixty-two times.

*Seventh.* "They brought unto him many that were possessed with devils; and he cast out the (*pneuma*\*) spirits with his word."—Matt. 8: 16. We have now come to an example where *pneuma* is used to denote a being. It is thus used sixty-five times. In Heb. 1: 7, 14, we learn that angels are "ministering (*pneuma*) spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation." Angels have always appeared as tangible organisms. "The angels that sinned" are called "unclean (*pneuma*) spirits." These frequently took possession of men and women, as they do at the present day, in what is now known as Spiritualism—then as sorcery, necromancy and witchcraft—exerting an influence upon the mediums in a manner similar to that produced by a good mesmerizer. When Jesus cast them out, he removed their influence from the mediums, so that the latter enjoyed perfect self-possession.

*Eighth.* "When he had called unto him his disciples, he gave them power against unclean (*pneuma*) spirits, to cast them out."—Matt. 10: 1.

*Ninth.* "It is not ye that speak, but the (*pneuma*) spirit of your Father which speaketh in you."—Matt. 10: 20. In his example the Holy Spirit is indicated.

*Tenth.* I will put my (*pneuma*) spirit upon him, and he shall show judgment to the Gentiles."—Matt. 12: 18. This refers to the reception of the Holy Spirit by Christ.

*Eleventh.* "I cast out devils by the (*pneuma*) spirit of God."—Matt. 12: 28. This refers also to the Holy Spirit.

*Twelfth.* "Blasphemy against the Holy (*pneuma*) spirit shall not be forgiven unto men."—Matt. 12: 31.

---

\*We give the simple form of the word in all examples.

*Thirteenth.* "Whosoever speaketh against the Holy (*pneuma*) spirit, it shall not be forgiven him, neither in this world, neither in the world to come."—Matt. 12: 32.

*Fourteenth.* "The unclean (*pneuma*) spirit is gone out."—Matt. 12: 43. This refers to an evil *being* who had possession of an individual.

*Fifteenth.* "Then goeth he, and taketh with himself seven other (*pneuma*) spirits more wicked than himself, and they enter in."—Matt. 12: 45.

When a man is set free from the influence of evil spirits by the power of God, in answer to prayer, and afterwards rejects Christ, the evil angel returns in company with several others, "and the last state of that man is worse than the first." There appears to be a host in this condition at the present time. They are fulfilling the Scripture which says: "In the latter times some shall *depart* from the faith, giving heed to seducing spirits, and doctrines of devils."—1 Tim. 4: 1.

*Sixteenth.* "How then doth David in (*pneuma*) spirit call him Lord?"—Matt. 22: 43. Reference is here made to the instruction David received from the Holy Spirit.

*Seventeenth.* "The (*pneuma*) spirit indeed is willing, but the flesh is weak."—Matt. 26: 41. Spirit, in this example, indicates a state of *feeling*. The individual would like to perform the act, but his physical strength is deficient.

*Eighteenth.* "Jesus, when he had cried with a loud voice, yielded up the (*pneuma*) ghost."—Matt. 27: 50. This is one of the two examples where *pneuma* is improperly rendered ghost. The Syriac, Campbell, Wesley and Whiting, render the phrase, "the ghost"—"his spirit." Instead of the phrase, "yielded up the ghost," Wakefield and others render it, "he expired," which gives the true idea, as clearly expressed in other Scriptures. *Pneuma*, in this passage, as in several others, is used to denote "the breath of life." In the Emphatic Diaglott, *apheke to pneuma*, which is here translated "gave up the ghost," is properly rendered, "resigned the breath." *Pneuma* is used in the same sense in Lk. 8: 55, where we have an account of the raising of the daughter of Jarius. Jesus said, "Maid, arise. And her



(*pneuma*) spirit came again, and she arose straightway." Wakefield and Thompson render *pneuma* in this example by the word *breath*. *Pneuma* has the same signification in Jas. 2: 26. "The body without the (*pneuma*) spirit is dead." Our translators have placed *breath* in the margin, thus showing that they considered *breath* a proper rendering of *pneuma* in this Scripture. Wakefield and Griesbach render it *breath* in this passage. As this point will come up again, we pass it now, to notice the last example of *pneuma* in the gospel by Matthew.

*Nineteenth.* "Baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy (*pneuma*) Spirit."—Matt. 28: 19.

We have now examined all the passages in the twenty-eight chapters of Matthew, and the other gospels are similar, but have found nothing concerning an "immortal" or "never-dying spirit" in man, which leaves in a conscious state when the man is *dead*. Nothing yet appears to show that anything but "the breath of life" is taken away at the death of the physical organism.

Notwithstanding the Bible makes no mention of an "immortal" or "never-dying spirit," people have believed it so long, it is difficult to persuade them to let go of traditions and rely *wholly* upon the Bible for evidence to sustain their position. The more candid confess that the immortality of the spirit is taken for granted, rather than plainly expressed; but their fathers believed it, their minister preaches it, and consequently they *suppose* it is true. When we are shown that the *Bible* harmonizes with the idea that man is an immortal spirit, we shall be ready to believe it. If man has such a spirit which thinks, wills and reasons, when he is dead, why is it not specified somewhere in the Scriptures?

We will now notice some more examples where *pneuma* is used to represent a state of *feeling*. "Now while Paul waited for them at Athens, his (*pneuma*) spirit was stirred in him, when he saw the city wholly given over to idolatry."—Acts 17: 16. "Not slothful in business; fervent in (*pneuma*) spirit; serving the Lord."—Rom. 12: 11. "I had no rest in my (*pneuma*) spirit, because I found not Titus my brother."—2 Cor. 2: 13. "Let us cleanse ourselves

from all filthiness of the flesh and (*pneuma*) *spirit*.”—2 Cor. 7: 1. “Be renewed in the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of your mind.”—Eph. 4: 23. Stand fast in one (*pneuma*) *spirit*, with one mind, striving together for the faith of the gospel.”—Phil. 1: 27. “Whose adorning let it not be that outward adorning of plaiting the hair, and of wearing of gold.... but ...the ornament of a meek and quiet (*pneuma*) *spirit*, which is in the sight of God of great price.”—1 Pet. 3: 3, 4. “Ye have not received the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of bondage again to fear; but ye have received the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father. The (*pneuma*) *spirit* itself beareth witness with our (*pneuma*) *spirit*, that we are the children of God.”—Rom. 8: 15, 16.

How do we know when our sins are forgiven? By our *feelings*. What produces this change? The Holy Spirit acting upon our *feelings*, or nervous system. What feelings are thus produced? “Love, joy, peace,” etc. These feelings are the fruits of the Holy Spirit, and give us evidence that our sins are forgiven. “God hath given them the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of slumber”—margin, *remorse*.—Rom. 11: 8. “Shall I come unto you....in the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of meekness?”—1 Cor. 4: 21. “God hath not given us the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of fear.”—2 Tim. 1: 7.

Without quoting further examples, we think all must be satisfied that *pneuma* is frequently used to indicate a state of mind or *feeling*, but in these cases it does not denote something that acts independent of man’s physical organism when he is buried in the grave.

It sometimes happens that our opponents endeavor to turn the subject into ridicule by substituting the word *breath* in these examples. Such should remember that something more than ridicule, founded on false premises, is necessary to convince us we are in error on this point. No intelligent Bible student would claim for a moment that *pneuma* and *ruach* always mean *breath*.

“The (*pneuma*) wind bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth.”—John 3: 8. In this example, *pneuma* is used to represent the *air*, or “breath of life.” So in Mark 8: 12. “And he sighed deeply in his (*pneuma*)



*spirit.*" Sighing is the result of a peculiar kind of *breathing*. The Syriac version reads—"He sighed with his *breath*. This is the true idea. We know of no other way to sigh. This breath of life is *essential* to sustain life, and when taken away, death immediately succeeds, the agonies of dying end, and the sleep of death begins. When persons have been suffering extremely, they have often prayed the Lord to take away this *pneuma* or breath of life, that their pains might end. This was the case with Stephen, and in answer to prayer, it was taken away and "HE *fell asleep* ---- and devout men carried STEPHEN (not his house) to his burial." The same is true of our Savior, at the time of his death on the cross. After resigning his (*pneuma*) spirit, or breath, into the hands of the Father, "he gave up the ghost." Wakefield, Thompson, Mace, Campbell, Wesley, Whiting and the Syriac read—"He *expired*," instead of "He gave up the ghost," which is the correct idea. No one can die till the *pneuma*, or "breath of life," is taken away. "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled, thou takest away their *breath*, they *die* and return to their dust."—Ps. 104: 29. Before they can live again, they must be reorganized, and again receive the "breath of life." When speaking of the "two witnesses" who were slain, the Revelator says—"And after three days and a half the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of life from God entered into them, and they stood upon their feet."—Rev. 11: 11. Wakefield renders it "the *breath* of life." The latter agrees with all plain passages on this point. The whole Bible seems to harmonize with this position that *ruach* and *pneuma* are used to denote not only beings, state of feeling, and an influence, but the *atmosphere* surrounding this earth, which is called "the breath of life," without which, all living creatures would die at once and return to dust; and that nothing else leaves us at death. And we have failed to find anything in the Old or New Testament which teaches us that the spirit, or *pneuma*, which leaves us at death, is immortal or conscious when taken away from us.

Suppose a living man be put into a metallic coffin, which was afterwards closed and hermetically sealed, and this enveloped in another several feet thick, sealed in the same

way, where should we look for *the man*—the accountable being—in heaven, hell fire, or the coffin? Is he praising God among the angels, wailing with the damned, or asleep in death? What will become of that man if the dead rise not? Paul answers—"If there be no resurrection of the *dead*.... then they also which are fallen *asleep* in Christ are PERISHED."

We have now given examples of the four significations of the word *pneuma*.

1. It denotes the *air* we breathe, which is essential to sustain life.

2. A *being* either good or evil.

3. An *influence* proceeding from a being.

4. A *state of feeling* in any individual.

We believe that all the examples in the Bible where the words rendered *spirit* occur, when rightly understood, may be arranged under one of these four heads.

When *pneuma* is used to denote a *being*, it *never* represents a *disembodied* one, or something that has been embodied, and is now existing in a conscious state away from its physical organism. We hold that such a belief is unscriptural, unphilosophical, and absurd. Neither men nor angels were ever known to exist and act independent of material forms. He talks at random who speaks of "*disembodied beings*." He might as well speak of riding bodiless horses, or ploughing with immaterial oxen, and feasting on nonentities, and then going to rest "*beyond* the bounds of time and *space*."

There is a passage, which may be somewhat obscure as it now stands in our received version, that needs a moment's consideration. It is in 1 Cor. 5 : 5. "Deliver such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the (*pneuma*) *spirit* may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus." One thing is very plain in the Bible; to wit, that *the man* is not saved when his physical organism is destroyed, because that is what constitutes the man. This one passage should not be so distorted as to contradict all plain Scriptures. Other translations remove much of the obscurity from this text, and show its harmony with that which is positive and clear. We know of no better way to settle a doubtful passage, than to



compare it with other translations and the original. Wakefield renders this:—"Deliver such an one unto Satan for the *punishment* of the flesh." This harmonizes with the idea that the Lord *chastises* his children, or suffers them to be sorely tried by the tempter, that the dross may be removed; then the individual has a right spirit, which prepares him for salvation "in the day of the Lord Jesus." Mace's translation reads:—"Deliver such an one unto Satan to suffer *corporal punishment*." The same idea is conveyed in Wakefield. The Syriac renders it:—"That in spirit he may have *life*." Before his chastisement or "punishment," his spirit or disposition was such that the Lord could not accept him; but the rod of correction has subdued the carnal mind, removed the dross, and he now manifests the sweet spirit of Jesus, who will accept him when he comes in glory. Like David such an one can say:—"It is good for me that I have been *afflicted* that I might learn thy statutes." "Before I was afflicted I went astray; but now have I kept thy word." "Thou hast dealt well with thy servant . . . in faithfulness hast thou *afflicted* me."

Another objection is sometimes raised from Heb. 12:18-24.

"Ye are not come unto the mount that might be touched, and that burned with fire, nor unto blackness and darkness, and tempest, and the sound of a trumpet, and the voice of words; . . . but ye are come unto Mount Zion, and unto the city of the living God, the heavenly Jerusalem, and to an innumerable company of angels, to the general assembly and church of the first born, which are written in heaven, and to God the Judge of all, and to the (*pneuma*) *spirit* of just men made perfect, and to Jesus the mediator of the new covenant, and to the blood of sprinkling, that speaketh better things than that of Abel"

It is *certain* that "just men" are not "made *perfect*" before the coming of Christ, and the resurrection of the *dead*. Our opponents admit this. Paul says:—"Ye *are* come," speaking as though they were then there, but they were not then perfected in the kingdom of God; "For the Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father, with his angels, and *THEN* he shall reward every man according to his works."—Matt. 16:27. When speaking on this passage, Dr. Clarke says:—

"The description in these verses does not refer to a heavenly state. . . . In heaven there is no need of a Mediator or sprinkling of blood; but these are mentioned in the state which the apostle de-

scribes. The "first-born," he says, are those who first receive the gospel of Christ, and who are elsewhere termed the 'first fruits,'—'the spirits of just men made perfect.'" He says, "We cannot understand these terms without the assistance of Jewish phraseology. The Jews divide mankind into three classes: first, the just perfect; second, the wicked perfect; third, those between both. The just perfect are those who have conquered all brutal appetites and gross passions; . . . the wicked perfect are those who never repent; . . . the intermediate are those who are influenced partly by the evil principle, and partly by the good. . . . The spirits of the just men made perfect, or the righteous perfect, are the full-grown christians."

We find no proof here that men have immortal spirits, that fly away to praise the Lord or blaspheme his holy name, when *the men* are asleep in death.

In 1 Peter 4: 6, is an expression thought by some to favor the popular view in relation to the Spirit. "For this cause was the gospel preached to them that *are dead*, that they might be judged according to men in the flesh, but live according to God in the (*pneuma*) spirit."

It will be observed that these, who had the gospel preached to them, "*are dead*." Macknight renders this verse as follows:—"For this purpose the gospel hath been preached even to the *dead*, that although they might be condemned indeed by men in the flesh, yet they might live eternally by God in the (*pneuma*) spirit." Wakefield renders the passage: "For this indeed was the *effect* of the preaching of the gospel to the *dead*, that some will be punished as carnal men, but others lead a spiritual life unto God." This shows "the effect" of preaching the gospel. Some believed and led "a spiritual life," others disbelieved and will eternally perish.

There is one more passage that demands a passing notice, found in 1 Cor. 14: 32. And the (*pneuma*) *spirits* of the prophets are subject to the prophets." Paul is speaking about the proper order to be observed in their meetings. Only one should speak at a time, and he should give way for others at proper intervals, which are specified. Wakefield renders this: "And the spirits of *teachers* be subject to teachers, (for God hath nothing to do with confusion, but peace;) and so in all the assemblies of the saints." Macknight translates it—"The spiritual *gifts* of the prophets are subject to the prophets." This is in keeping with the teachings of the apostle, when he instructs us to be *subject* one to another



We have endeavored to notice all the strong passages which are thought to conflict with the position we have taken, and leave the candid reader to come to an honest conclusion.

We will now give all the examples where *pneuma* is not rendered *spirit*, or *ghost*, prefixed by the word *holy*.

1. *Pneuma* is rendered *ghost* twice. "Jesus, when he had cried with a loud voice, yielded up the *ghost*."—Matt. 27: 50. "When Jesus therefore had received the vinegar, he said, it is finished; and he bowed his head, and gave up the *ghost*."—John 19: 30.

2. *Pneuma* is rendered *life* once. "He had power to give *life* unto the image of the beast."—Rev. 13: 15.

3. *Pneuma* is rendered *spiritual* once, "Forasmuch as ye are zealous of *spiritual* gifts, seek that ye may excel to the edifying of the church."—1 Cor. 14: 12.

4. *Pneuma* is rendered *spiritually* once. "To be *spiritually* minded is life and peace."—Rom. 8: 6.

5. *Pneuma* is rendered *wind* once. "The *wind* bloweth where it listeth, and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh, and whither it goeth."—John 3: 8.

When the word *pneuma* is preceded by the word *holy*, it is usually rendered *ghost* in the received version. It is thus rendered ninety times out of ninety-three. We do not need to burden the reader with a list of these, as he has only to bear in mind that the phrases "Holy Spirit" and "Holy Ghost" are synonymous. The word *ghost* conveys a wrong idea to many readers; especially when it is said one gives "up the ghost." The literal rendering of the phrase, as given by the American Bible Union, and others, is "*expire*," or "*expired*." All the examples in the Old Testament have this signification.

From a careful examination of the word *ruach* in the Old Testament, and *pneuma* in the New, we are fully satisfied that these words are *never* used in the *Bible*, to represent conscious entity, or being, that leaves man at death to enter heaven, hell, or the "spheres." When "the breath of life" permanently leaves the man, he lives no more till the resurrection, when his physical system is reorganized. This "breath of life" is no more *the man*, than the steam is the engine, or the wind the windmill. It did not enter us as an intelligent organism, neither does it leave as such. In all the four hundred passages in the Old, and the three hundred and eighty-five in the New Testament, where these words occur, we do not find one which teaches that when this spirit

or breath is in man, that it is the thinking, accountable part or that it ever did or ever will think. Why is the Bible wholly silent on this point? Why are we not taught somewhere that the *ruach* or *pneuma* is "the real man"? The answer is obvious. The Spirit of God acknowledges no such doctrine, therefore the word of the Lord does not teach it to the children of men.

It is very comforting and strengthening to the child of God, to find the Bible in harmony with itself on this point, and with reason, facts and philosophy. If it were not so, we should have reason to doubt. As it is, we have no misgivings about the matter. We are conscious that we have great reason to thank the Lord for the light he has shown us upon this subject. It has removed the dark mysticism that once beclouded our minds, and presented to us a "blessed" and reasonable hope, established upon the immutable promise and oath of God. We do not see how any one can understand the plan of salvation, or have a true gospel hope, till it is seen that the *whole man* sins, repents, dies, and lives again at the resurrection, when Christ comes. The evidence now thickens about us showing that the time is at hand when they "that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth."

"Fly swifter round, ye wheels of time,  
And bring the welcome day." [Watts.

MILES GRANT.

Published at the World's Crisis Office, 167 Hanover  
Street, Boston, Mass.



# WHAT IS MAN?

## A BIBLE VIEW OF HIS CREATION.

### THE MEANING OF SOUL, SPIRIT, DEATH, AND HELL.

---

#### WHAT IS MAN? Ps. 8: 4.

It is said, "The proper study of mankind is Man;" and, doubtless, we shall do well if we take heed to the wise saying, — "*Know thyself.*"

We purpose to give a *Bible* answer to the question, "What is man?" showing his constitution, history, and future destiny.

There is a variety of opinions in relation to man's origin and end. Some deny the Bible account of his creation, and think he originated among the lower order of animals, and attained his present wonderful organism by the law of *progression*. If this were true, we think we should see animals changing to men at the present day, in obedience to the same law; but it happens that there is not one particle of evidence of any such progress. The petrified animals of early days, found embedded in the rocks, are just as perfect in all their parts, so far as can be ascertained, as the animals of the same species living at the present time.

Some who admit the Bible record of man's *origin*,

deny many of the events connected with his *history*, as recorded in the same book ; and also reject the statement relating to his *final destiny*.

Some believe that when man is dead he never lives again ; others that he is immortal, and never dies ; others that though he may die, he will have a resurrection from the dead. Some believe the resurrection is spiritual and at death ; others that a new organism is created when the time comes to raise the dead ; and another class, that the very material organism that is laid in the grave will be reorganized, and live again. It is evident that all of these opinions cannot be right. Our purpose is to see which is in harmony with the *Bible*.

#### CREATION OF MAN.

In order to obtain a clear answer to the question, it will be necessary to examine the account of the creation of man, as recorded in Gen. 2: 7.

“And the Lord God formed *man* of the dust of the ground, and breathed into his nostrils the breath of life, and *man* became a living soul.”

The question arises, did the Lord form “*man* of the dust of the ground ?” or a “prison-house” to put him in ? The Lord says it was *man*. Do we believe it ? It is important that we settle in our minds what constitutes *man* before we proceed in our examination. If *man* was not made “of the *dust of the ground*,” then the account of his creation is not correct. The Bible declares that the “Lord God *forméd* man ;” this implies, certainly, that he was *made* out of *something*, and did not exist from eternity, or before he was thus made ; and it is pos-



itively declared that the accountable, intelligent being, called by our Creator, *man*, was made of *dust* on the sixth day of creation. Did he exist before that day? If so, the record is not true, and we are left to *guess* at his origin.

“THE BREATH OF LIFE.”

If the being thus formed of the dust of the ground, whom the *Lord* calls *man*, is *not* man, then, we ask, who, or what is man? We have sometimes been told that it was “*the breath of life*,” which was breathed into his nostrils. We think those who hold this position will abandon it, after a little examination. If the “breath of life” breathed into Adam’s nostrils was *the man*, then it follows, he whom the Lord made “of the dust of the ground,” and called man, was *misnamed* by his Creator. It will be observed that nothing was added to man after his creation, but “the breath of life:” hence, the breath must be *the man*, if the material organism is not, which was formed “of the dust of the ground;” but this organism is called *man*, before he receives “the breath of life,” and after it has left him.

Which is “the accountable being?” Is it the one *formed* of the dust of the ground, or the *breath* received into his nostrils? Let us suppose that this breath of life is the real man, and that the body is only a prison-house to hold him during his stay upon earth. This being true, wherever we find this “breath of life,” we shall find a *man*, whether it be in a human organism, or any other.

The word rendered *breath*, in Gen. 2: 7, is *n'shahmah*, and occurs twenty-four times in the Bible. We have

an example in Isa. 2 : 22. "Cease ye from *man*, whose *breath* (*n'shahmah*) is in *his* nostrils." Which is the *man* in this example? Can any one suppose it is his *breath*? The idea is absurd, for it would locate the *man* in his own nostrils. We find the same word again in Gen. 7: 22. "*All* in whose nostrils was the *breath of life*, of all that was in the dry land, *died*." Who are meant by "*all*?" Read the preceding verse, and the subject is plain.

"And all flesh *died* that moved upon the earth, both of fowl, and of cattle, and of beast, and of every creeping thing that creepeth upon the earth, and every *man*; *all* in whose nostrils was the *breath* (*n'shahmah*) of life."

We now see that not only *man*, but the *fowls*, *cattle*, *beasts*, and *creeping things*, have the same "breath of life;" hence the wise man says, in Eccl. 3 : 19, when speaking of men and beasts "they have all *one breath*." This is in harmony with what we have just quoted from Gen. 7: 21-22; consequently it follows, that, if this "*breath of life*" is the *real man*, he exists, not only in his own nostrils, but in all the animal creation. Without pursuing this absurd position any further, we think all must be satisfied that the "*breath of life*" breathed into man's nostrils *is not the man*.

Then "what is man?" Is the being formed of the dust of the ground, properly called *man* before he receives "the breath of life?" The Lord so called him, and we think he knew best. If he was correctly denominated *man before* he received "the breath or life," is it not equally correct to call him *man after* the breath of life leaves him? In Luke 7: 12, we read,



"Now when he (Jesus) came nigh to the gate of the city, behold there was a *dead man* carried out." This one is still called a *man*, though *dead*. The Bible nowhere teaches that anything leaves man at death, but "the breath of life." We have found that this breath of life caused man, previously created, to *live*; then, we should naturally suppose that the taking away of his breath would produce *death*. Says David, when speaking of man, in Ps. 146: 4, "His *breath* goeth forth, *he* returneth to his earth; in that very day his *thoughts perish*." Again, in Ps. 104: 29, we read, "Thou hidest thy face, they are troubled; thou takest away their *breath*, they *die*, and return to their dust." This makes the matter perfectly plain.

Some think they find an exception in Eccl. 12: 7, "Then shall the dust return to the dust as it was, and the *spirit* shall return to God who gave it." The word here rendered *spirit* is the same as the one translated *breath*, which we have just quoted from the Psalms. It will be observed that the word *spirit* or *breath*, in Eccl. 12: 7, is represented by the pronoun *it*, in the neuter gender. If this breath is *the man*, we should expect it would read, and the spirit shall return to God who gave *him*. If this spirit, or breath, is the *real man*, then he was not made of dust, as the Bible declares; and it was not correct to call him man, who was thus formed. Let us adhere to the *Bible*, if our creeds are all ruined. That teaches that *man* was made of dust, and turns to dust again, to await a resurrection from the dead.

It appears plain that the *breath of life* breathed into Adam's nostrils was *not the man*; then, of course, it fol-

lows that when this breath (spirit) of life returns to "God who gave it," it is no proof the *man* has gone. This breath of life breathed into *man's* nostrils, we have found to be common to *all* animals, and returns to God as much from them at death, as from him.

We will here notice an objection sometimes presented against the position we have taken, in saying that the breath of life in *man's* nostrils is the same as that in other animals. Notwithstanding the wise man has declared in Eccl. 3: 19, that men and beasts "have all *one breath*," still they think the breath of life in man must be different from that in the beast, and quote as proof, Gen. 2: 7, contending that the expression, "breath of life," should be rendered in the plural, — "breath of *lives*;" indicating that man has a *natural* life in common with the beast, and a *spiritual* life in addition to that possessed by the animal; but it happens that the same expression is applied to beasts, as in Gen. 7: 22, "All in whose nostrils was the breath of life," (or lives.) The simple idea is, this breath of life is *common* to all living creatures, and hence is properly called "the breath of *lives*."

We see no possible way to make out that the "breath of life" is *the man*, but it is clear that he cannot be a *living* man, or animal, after its departure. When the breath is taken away, "they *die* and return to their dust." Ps. 104: 29.

"*What is Man?*" We answer, a *living* man is an organized being, made "of the dust of the ground," having "the breath of life." A *dead* man is the same being *without* the breath of life.



We have now endeavored to show from the Bible, that in *no* case is it proper to call "the breath of life," which was breathed into Adam's nostrils at creation, and which returns to God at death, the *man*.

### "LIVING SOUL."

The living man is frequently called, in the Bible, "a living soul," as in Gen. 2: 7, but *never* an immortal soul. The word immortal is found but *once* in the whole Bible, which is in 1 Tim. 1: 17, and is applied to our heavenly Father.—"Now unto the King eternal, *immortal*, invisible, the only wise God, be honor and glory forever and ever. Amen."

In relation to the phrase "living soul," in Gen. 2: 7, we would remark, that it is an expression applicable to *all* living creatures, but no more to man than any other being. The words rendered "living soul," in Genesis, are from the Hebrew words *nephesh khayah*, and are first applied to animals in Gen. 1: 20. "And God said, let the waters bring forth abundantly the moving creature *that hath life*," (*nephesh khayah*), or as in the margin, "living soul." Here we learn that all the animals in the waters are *living souls*. This is in harmony with Rev 16: 3. "And the second angel poured out his vial upon the sea; and it became as the blood of a dead man; and every *living soul* died in the sea." This passage teaches us again, that the animals in the *sea* are *living souls*." The same fact is repeated again in Gen. 1: 21.—"And God created great whales and every *living creature* (*nephesh khayah*) that moveth." In Gen. 1: 24, we learn that all animals upon the *land* are "living souls."

“And God said let the earth bring forth the *living creature* (*nephesh khayah*) after his kind, cattle, and creeping thing, and beast of the earth after his kind.” The same truth is expressed again in Gen. 1: 30. “And to every beast of the earth, and to every fowl of the air, and to everything that creepeth upon the earth wherein there is life (*nephesh khayah*, or “living soul,” as in the margin,) I have given every green herb for meat.” These scriptures show us that it is no more proper to call *man* a “living soul,” than every other animal. As we have before remarked, every living creature is called in Bible language, a “living soul;” but we find *no* intimation in these scriptures that man is an *immortal* soul, unless we adhere to what Satan told our first parents, in Gen. 3: 4, when he said, “Ye shall not surely die.”

#### MODERN THEOLOGY.

We will now compare the *Bible* with modern theology, to see how far we can harmonize the two. Says a popular writer:—

“The *soul* lives in the body just as a man lives in a house. When the house is carried away by a flood, or burned up, or it becomes old and falls to pieces, or anything else happens so that the man cannot live in it any longer, he chooses a house somewhere else and goes to live in that. So your *soul* must move away at some time and leave the body.”

Says a distinguished minister:—

“The *soul*, by its own inherent energy, triumphs over the decaying structure which it inhabits. . . . It is this spiritual organism which sees and hears and feels, which



suffers and enjoys, which thinks and wills and executes ; which is, in short, *the real man*."

There seems to be a wide difference between modern theology and the position we have taken, and we know of no way to ascertain which is right, only by an appeal to the *Bible*, which we consider as the *only* rule of faith and practice. Well, "what saith the scripture?" "*Man dieth*, and wasteth away." — "*Man* lieth down and riseth not, till the heavens be no more ; they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their *sleep*." Job 14: 10, 12. We believe Job means a "*real man*," when he says, "*man dieth*." Hear the popular theologian once more. "O listen, *man* ! a voice within us speaks the startling word, '*man*, thou shalt never die !'" How well this last compares with what Satan said to our first parents, "Ye shall not surely die." The *Lord* said, "*thou* shalt surely die." Which told the truth, the Lord or the devil ? Both addressed the "*real man* ;" not the "*house*" he lived in. Listen to the Lord, while talking to Adam after his transgression. "In the sweat of *thy* face shalt *thou* eat bread, till *thou* return unto the *ground* ; for out of it wast *thou* taken ; for dust *thou* art, and unto dust shalt *thou* return." Gen. 3: 19. Does the word *thou* stand for the *house*, or the "*real man*?" Is a man's house guilty ? Do we talk to a man's house, or the man in it ? The answer is obvious. In this case, and all others in the Bible, we find that the conscious part, which is addressed as the accountable being, is represented as *returning* to the *ground* at death, instead of heaven, or a place of torment ; and that nowhere in the Bible is the *man* said to be alive between death and the

resurrection. Hear the word of the Lord to Abraham. "*Thou* shalt go to thy fathers in peace, *thou* shalt be buried in a good old age." Gen. 15: 15. What does the word *thou* stand for in this passage? Certainly not for the *house* (body), if the theological description of man is correct, but for the "real man," Abraham; then it follows, that when the time came that *he* "must move away," *he* was moved to a place where he was "*buried.*"

Let us look at a few records of death as given in the Bible. "For *David*, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on *sleep*, and was laid unto his fathers and saw corruption." Acts 13: 36. From this scripture, we learn that whatever constituted *David*, "*fell on sleep.*" Was this David's belief when alive? Said he, — "I shall be satisfied when I *awake* with thy likeness." Ps. 17: 15. This shows that he expected to fall asleep. Some tell us David is in heaven. Let Peter testify. — "Men and brethren, let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch *David*, that he is both *dead* and *buried.* . . . David is *not* ascended into the heavens." Acts 2: 29, 34. Can anything be plainer? If David is *dead*, does he know anything? Says the wise man, "The dead know not anything." Is there a passage in the Bible which contradicts this plain statement, and shows that "a dead man" has any knowledge? We have not been able to find it. If a dead man knows nothing, then he cannot praise the Lord while in that state. Hear David on this point. "The dead praise not the Lord, neither any that go down into silence." Ps. 115: 17. When will man be raised from "the sleep of death?" Job gives a plain answer. "So



man ("the real man") lieth down, and *riseth not till the heavens be no more*; they shall not awake, nor be raised out of their *sleep*." Job 14: 12. This harmonizes perfectly with the teachings of our Saviour. He says, "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life; and I will raise *him up at the last day*." John 6: 40.

As we have looked at the simplicity and plainness of the Bible on this point, we have often wondered why all do not see it; for there is no truth in the Scriptures plainer to our mind, than that the *whole man* dies, and remains dead until the resurrection "at the last day." Hence it follows, as Paul says, if there is no resurrection of the dead, "they also which are fallen *asleep* in Christ are *perished*." Does *perished* mean "gone to glory?" *Perish* is defined by Webster to mean, — "to waste away," "to die," "to depart wholly," "to be extirpated," "to come to nothing." Such, then, is the condition of those who have "fallen asleep in *Christ*" if the dead rise not; but this cannot be true if "the real man" "moves away" at death, and goes to his reward.

#### MY SOUL, THY SOUL, ETC.

Those who claim that man is a double entity, think they find proof of it in the expressions "My soul," "thy soul," "his soul," &c., which frequently occur in the Bible. Let us take examples. Ps. 131: 2. "Surely I have behaved and quieted *myself* (*nephesh*, — margin, my soul) as a child that is weaned of his mother; my soul is even as a weaned child." "And Samson said,

let *me* (*nephesh*, margin, my soul) *die* with the Philistines." If this passage had been rendered *my soul*, instead of *me*, then it would have taught that the *soul dies*, which would be in harmony with the plain teaching of the Bible. We see from these examples, and many more might be brought, that "my soul," "myself," and "me," are from the same Hebrew word, *nephesh*, and may be used interchangeably, meaning the *whole man*.

The same is true of the phrases, "thy soul," "thy person," "thyself;" "her soul," "her," "herself;" "his soul," "himself," "he;" "our soul," "we;" "your soul," "yourselves," "you;" "their souls," "they" and "themselves."

In Isa. 5: 11, we read, "therefore hell (*sheol*) enlarged *herself*, (*nephesh*). Had *nephesh* in this verse been rendered *soul*, it would have shown that *hell* itself is possessed of one, but when hell (*sheol*, the grave;) is personified, and her soul used in the sense of herself, all is plain.

When the Psalmist is speaking of Joseph, in Ps. 105: 18, he says, "Whose feet they hurt with fetters: *he* (*nephesh*, margin, his *soul*,) was laid in irons." We here learn the true meaning of the expression, his soul; namely, the whole man, Joseph.

Ps. 35: 25. "Let them not say in their hearts, ah, so would *we* (*nephesh*, margin, our *soul*,) have it."

Jer. 37: 9. "Thus saith the Lord, deceive not *yourselves*," (*nephesh*, margin, your *souls*.) — 2 Cor. 12: 15. "And I will very gladly spend and be spent for *you*," (*psukee*,\* margin, your *soul*.)

\* Greek word corresponding with *nephesh*.



Job 26: 14. "*They* (*nephesh*, margin, *their soul*,) die in youth." If this had been rendered, "*their souls die* in youth," some would have read it with astonishment, but it would have been as correct as the present translation, and led people to see the true meaning of such expressions. Isa. 47: 14. "Behold, they shall be as stubble; the fire shall burn them; they shall not deliver *themselves* (*nephesh*, margin, *their souls*,) from the power of the flame."

From a careful and thorough examination of this subject, we are most fully satisfied, that the word *soul* is *never* used in the *Bible* to represent a *conscious* part of man existing when he is dead.

#### SHEOL AND HADES.\*

It is said that "the real man" goes to *sheol*, or *hades*, at death, and remains there in a *conscious* state until the resurrection at the last day, when he is reunited with his body, and receives his final reward or punishment. *Sheol*, or *hades*, is said to be divided into two principal parts; one of which is for the righteous, and called paradise, and the other for the wicked, called hell, gehenna, or tartarus.

In paradise, the righteous are said to be waiting for the resurrection of the body, at the coming of the Lord, when they enter upon their full reward. They enjoy considerable in their present situation, but it is very far from what they will experience when they get into their bodies again.

\* The Greek word corresponding with *sheol*.

The wicked, who are said to be in the other part of *sheol* or *hades*, are more unhappy than they were in this world, but will suffer infinitely more, after they come out of *hades* and enter their bodies.

Let us examine this theology in the light of the Scriptures. Where does the Bible locate paradise? We are agreed as to the location of the paradise in the days of Adam, that it was not *in* the earth, but *upon* it. But this is not the one where the righteous go at death. In Rev. 2: 7, we read, he "that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life, which is in the midst of the *paradise* of God." We learn that there was a "tree of life" in the garden of Eden, but Adam was driven from paradise, "lest he put forth his hand, and take also of the tree of life, and eat, and live forever." The passage in Rev. 2: 7, intimates that there is to be a "restitution" of the primitive state of man, as it was before he sinned; and in keeping with this, we read in Acts 3: 20, 21, "And he shall send Jesus Christ, which before was preached unto you; whom the heaven must receive until the times of *restitution* of all things, which God hath spoken by the mouth of all the holy prophets since the world began." This shows that we are to look for the *restoration* of paradise. Will it be *in sheol* or *hades*? The idea is absurd. Where will it be? In Rev., chaps. 21 and 22, we have a description of a "new heaven and a new earth," and the "new Jerusalem," wherein is said to be "the tree of life, which bare twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month." We have now found the location of paradise, where the thief is to be, which is in the



kingdom of God; for "the tree of life" "is in the midst of the paradise of God," Rev. 2: 7; and it is also in the new earth; but the new earth is not in *sheol* or *hades*, consequently paradise is not there. Then it follows as a matter of course that the righteous do not go to paradise at *death*, for the new earth, or paradise, is not prepared till after "the first resurrection."

*Sheol* and *hades* represent the place where men are put between death and the resurrection. All admit that the *body* knows nothing, but the conscious part which we *address* by the word *thou*, is said to be conscious in *sheol*. Let us hear from the Bible on this point. "There is *no* work, nor device, nor *knowledge*, nor *wisdom*, in the grave (*sheol*), whither *thou* goest." Eccl. 9: 10. This scripture forever settles the point that the dead are *unconscious* between death and the resurrection, while they remain in *sheol*; for where there is *no knowledge*, there is no consciousness, and if no consciousness, there can be no happiness or misery. Then we must conclude that man receives no part of his reward, or punishment, in *sheol* or *hades*, between death and the resurrection.

We will now give a few facts in relation to *sheol*. This is the *only* word in the Old Testament which is rendered hell. It is found sixty-five times in the text, and twice in the margin, making sixty-seven in all. It is rendered *hell* thirty-one times, *grave* thirty-three times, two of which are in the margin, and *pit* three times.

## THEOLOGICAL MEANING OF SHEOL.

The following are the *theological* definitions of *sheol*;  
 “The infernal regions of the dead.” “The final and  
 eternal receptacle of all the ungodly and impenitent.”  
 “The eternal, invisible state of the wicked.”

Let us apply these definitions to the Scriptures. The first passage in which the word *sheol* occurs, is in Gen. 37: 35, where Jacob's feelings are expressed concerning the supposed loss of his son Joseph. — “And he said, for I will go down into the grave (*sheol*) unto my son mourning.” It would read strangely if we should put “infernal regions,” or “hell,” in the place of grave. Take another example in Job 14: 13. “O that thou wouldest hide *me* in the *grave*,” (*sheol*.) Did Job wish to be hid in “the final and eternal receptacle of all the ungodly and impenitent?” In Psalms 16: 10, where David is prophesying of Christ, he says, “thou wilt not leave my *soul* in *hell*,” (*sheol*.) Does he mean the place where the wicked will be punished? When we examined Eccl. 9: 10, we found it declared that there is *no knowledge* in *sheol* — the grave. This is in harmony with Ps. 31: 17. “Let the *wicked* be ashamed, and let them be *silent* in the grave,” (*sheol*.) Are they *silent* in the theological hell, or place of torment? When Jacob was speaking to his sons about taking Benjamin to Egypt, he says, “My son shall not go down with you; for his brother is *dead*, and he is left alone; if mischief befall him by the way in which ye go, then shall ye bring down my grey hairs with sorrow to the grave,” (*sheol*.) Did he mean “the eternal invisible state of the wicked?” We see that the *theological* definition of *sheol* makes



strange sense. We think a further examination of this subject will make all plain.

#### BIBLE MEANING OF SHEOL.

As the *theological* definition of this word makes the Bible teach "monstrous opinions," we will now take another look into the Hebrew lexicon, to get the meaning of *sheol*, the place where men go at death. Roy defines it to mean "the grave," — "sepulchre;" and gives as examples, Ps. 86: 13, and 116: 3. "For great is thy mercy toward me, and thou hast delivered my soul from the lowest hell," (*sheol*.) "The sorrows of death compassed me, and the pains of hell (*sheol*) gat hold upon me." The last definition, given by Roy, makes many dark passages plain. For instance, Ps. 16: 10, and Acts 2: 27, where it is said of Christ, "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell" (*sheol*), or the grave.

We now assume that *sheol*, the only word rendered hell in the Old Testament, *never* relates to the future punishment of the wicked, but always refers to the grave, where the whole man is laid at death. Let us examine some of the strongest passages which are thought to have reference to future punishment. Turn to Ps. 9: 17. "The wicked shall be turned<sup>\*</sup> into hell (*sheol*), and all the nations that forget God." We learn from the Bible that the wicked are to die "the second death," or be buried in *sheol*, the grave, the second time, and rise no more forever. Says Paul, "The wages of sin is death."

\* The Hebrew word here rendered *turned* is more properly translated *returned*.

“Let death seize upon them, and let them go down quick into hell, (*sheol* — margin, grave,) for wickedness is in their dwellings and among them.” Ps. 55 : 15. In Deut. 32 : 22, we read, “A fire is kindled in mine anger, and shall burn unto the lowest hell (*sheol*), and shall consume the earth with her increase, and set on fire the foundations of the mountains.” Some have thought “the lowest hell” was where the most wicked people go; but we think the Scriptures warrant no such idea. We know that some are buried deep in the earth, and others near the surface; and a fire which shall “set on fire the foundations of the mountains,” must, we think, burn to the lowest hell, or grave.

The grave, or *sheol*, is sometimes personified, as is also death. In Isa. 14 : 9-11, the Lord addresses Babylon, and says:—

“Hell (*sheol*) from beneath is moved for thee to meet thee at thy coming; it stirreth up the *dead* for thee, even all the chief ones of the earth; it hath raised up from their thrones all the kings of the nations. And they shall speak and say unto thee, Art thou also become as we? art thou become like unto us? Thy pomp is brought down to the grave (*sheol*), and the noise of thy viols; the worm is spread under thee, and the worms cover thee.”

In this example, the *dead* are represented as being stirred up to talk to Babylon, when she comes down among them to have “the worms cover” her in the grave.

We find another similar example in Ezek. 31 : 15-17, where it said of Pharaoh, at the time he was overthrown in the Red Sea, —

“Thus saith the Lord God, in the day when he went down to the grave (*sheol*), I caused a mourning. I covered the deep for him, and I restrained the floods thereof



and the great waters were stayed; and I caused Lebanon to mourn for him, and all the trees of the field fainted for him. I made the nations to shake at the sound of his fall, when I cast him down to hell (*sheol*) with them that descend into the pit; and all the trees of Eden, the choice and best of Lebanon, all that drink water, shall be comforted in the nether parts of the earth. They also went down into hell (*sheol*, the grave,) with him, unto them that be slain with the sword; and they that were his arm, that dwelt under his shadow in the midst of the heathen."

There is one more example where the grave is personified, which is found in Ezek. 32: 21-27.

"The strong among the mighty shall speak to him (Pharaoh) out of the midst of hell (*sheol*) with them (the Egyptians) that help him; they are gone down, they lie uncircumcised, *slain* by the sword. Asshur is there, and all her company; his graves are about him, all of them *slain*, *fallen* by the sword; whose graves are set in the sides of the pit, and her company is round about her grave, all of them *slain*, fallen by the sword, which caused terror in the land of the *living*. There is Elam and all her multitude round about her grave; all of them *slain*, fallen by the sword, which are gone down uncircumcised into the nether parts of the earth, which caused their terror in the land of the *living*; yet have they borne their shame with them that go down to the pit. They have set her a bed in the midst of the *slain* with all her multitude; her graves are round about him; all of them uncircumcised, *slain* by the sword; though their terror was caused in the land of the *living*, yet have they borne their shame with them that go down to the pit; he is put in the midst of them that be *slain*. There is Meshech, Tubal, and all her multitude; her graves are round about him (Pharaoh); all of them uncircumcised, *slain* by the sword, though they caused their

terror in the land of the *living*. And they shall not lie with the mighty that are fallen of the uncircumcised, which have gone down to hell (*sheol*) with their weapons of war; and they have laid their swords under their heads; but their iniquities shall be upon their *bones*, though they were the terror of the mighty in the land of the *living*."

Let us review this scripture a few moments. It will be observed that this host were all warriors "*slain by the sword*," who caused much "terror in the land of the *living*." The plain inference is, they are now *dead* in hell, (or *sheol*.) This inference amounts to positive evidence, when we take the sense of the 27th verse. They "are gone down to hell (*sheol*) with their *weapons of war*; and they have laid their *swords under their heads*; but their iniquities shall be upon their *bones*." Do men's souls take their weapons of war down to the *theological* hell of torment, and lay their *swords* under the *heads* of their *souls*? The idea is *absurd*! What, then, does this scripture mean? Why, simply, that when those warriors were buried in hell (*sheol*), they buried them with their armor on, and laid their swords under their heads, which is a common practice among many. What is their condition in hell, or *sheol*—the grave? "There is *no knowledge*, nor wisdom in the grave (*sheol*), whither thou goest."

We have now examined all the strong passages in the Old Testament which can be made to teach consciousness and suffering in hell (*sheol*), and we leave the reader to form his own conclusion.



## HELL, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

Having examined the texts in the *Old Testament* that are rendered *hell*, and found no proof that they refer to a place of future punishment, or consciousness between death and the resurrection, but in all cases mean simply the *grave*; we now pass to the examination of the *New*.

There are three words in the New Testament which are rendered *hell*; to wit, *hades*, *gehenna*, and *tartarus*.

*Hades* is found eleven times, *gehenna* twelve, and *tartarus* once. When hell is from *hades*, it never refers to the future punishment of the wicked, but means simply the grave, as does *sheol*, the corresponding word in the Old Testament. The word is found in the following passages: Matt. 12: 23; 16: 18; Luke 10: 15; 16: 23; Acts 2: 27, 31; 1 Cor. 15: 55; Rev. 1: 18; 6: 8; 20: 13, 14. (Our readers will do well to mark these verses.)

Says Dr. Kitto, in his *Cyclopædia of Biblical Literature*, "*Hades* means literally that which is in darkness." Job, in describing the state of man in death, calls it "a land of darkness, as darkness itself." See Job 10: 18-22.

Kitto says, — "that a careful examination will lead to the conclusion that *no sanction* to an intermediate state is afforded by these passages where *hades* occurs, but that they denote the grave . . . both of the righteous and wicked."

Says Geo. Campbell, a Presbyterian commentator, of Scotland, — "In my judgment, *hades* ought never, in Scripture, to be rendered hell. . . . *Sheol* (the corresponding Hebrew word) signifies the state of the dead in general, without regard to goodness."

Moses Stuart says, "*Sheol*" means "grave, sepulchre, under world, or state of the dead." Again he says, — "*Hades* means grave, sepulchre, depository of the *dead*."

Hell is an old Saxon word which signified to *cover*; hence, when a thing was helled, it was covered up. This word was appropriately employed to represent the place where the dead were laid, and buried; but we repeat, *hades* and *sheol*, in the Bible, never refer to the future punishment of the wicked, or a place of consciousness between death and the resurrection.

#### GEHENNA.

We now pass to the examination of the word *gehenna*, which is found twelve times in the New Testament, and occurs in the following passages: Matt. 5: 22, 29, 30; 10: 28; 18: 9; 23: 15, 33; Mk. 9: 43, 45, 47; Lk. 12: 5; Jas. 3: 6.

"*Gehenna*," says a learned author, "does not occur in the Septuagint Greek of the Old Testament, nor in any classic author in the world. It was understood by the Jews, and employed *only* in discourses with them."

The word *gehenna* refers to the "Valley of Hinnom," where they offered sacrifices to Moloch, and kept fire burning to *consume* the filth which was cast into this place. When the Saviour was speaking to the Jews on the subject of the future punishment of the wicked, he *illustrates* their destruction, by referring to the Valley of Hinnom, where they *burnt up* their filthy matter. No one ever thought of casting a thing there for *preservation*. And in order to make the point strong indeed, and show that no portion of the wicked man will be



preserved, the Saviour says "the fire shall not be quenched." Or, as it is expressed in Matt. 3: 12, "He will *burn up* the chaff (the wicked) with *unquenchable* fire." If the fire could be quenched, then the chaff would not be "*burnt up*," for we never speak of quenching a fire, unless we intend to prevent some part of the burning substance from being wholly consumed. Whatever is cast into an *unquenchable* fire must of necessity be *burnt up*; unless it be something upon which the fire has *no* effect, in which case no suffering could be produced. Had the word *gehenna* been fully translated, it would have been rendered, "The fire of the valley of Hinnom." This place where filth was burnt up, was presented to the Jews to *illustrate* the future punishment of the wicked. As the carcasses and filth were *burnt up* in "the fire of the valley of Hinnom;" so are the wicked to be finally "*destroyed*, and that without *remedy*." Prov. 29: 1.

## TARTARUS.

"The word *Tartarus*, rendered hell, in 2 Pet. 2: 4, means, in a *physical sense*, the bounds or verge of the material creation."—*Dr. Parkhurst*.

The passage in Peter is the *only* one where the word occurs, and is employed to represent the locality of the fallen angels; but has nothing to do with the future punishment of the wicked. The use of the word among the ancients, and its application to the demons, or angels that sinned, show most clearly, in connection with facts mentioned in the Scripture, that *Tartarus* refers, as

Suidas remarks, to "the place in the clouds," or "in the air."

We have now noticed all the words rendered *hell*, but find nothing to favor the popular theological definition, which makes it a place where the wicked suffer eternal misery; hence we conclude that the *Bible* hell, and the *theological*, are quite different. In which shall we believe?

But there is a passage found in Matt. 25: 46, which is thought to stand as a Gibraltar rock, in opposition to the position we have taken. It reads, — "And these shall go away into everlasting punishment; but the righteous into life eternal."

The word rendered "everlasting," is from the same word (*aionion*) in the original, as the word "eternal" in the same text; hence it follows that the punishment of the wicked is as long as the life of the righteous, which is eternal. No man believes in eternal punishment stronger than the writer. But what is the punishment? This passage only gives its *duration*, consequently we must examine other texts to ascertain *how* the wicked are punished. We find many plain declarations on this point, but we will only quote one now, which is found in Rom. 6: 23. "The wages of sin is *death*; but the *gift* of God is eternal life through Jesus Christ." We have yet to learn from the Bible, or any other common-sense book, that *death* means *life* in misery; or, as sometimes expressed, "A death that never, never dies." It would be just as consistent to say, a life "that never, never lives," which is an absurdity. Observe, the wages of sin is not *dying*, but



*death*, which is the *end* of dying. A person is not dead, till the act of dying is *completed*; and when dead, they "know not anything," and consequently suffer nothing. We learn from Rev. 20: 14, that the death-penalty for sin "is the *second* death." If there is a *second*, there must be a *first* death, and the second must be *like* the first; but the first is a *literal* death, or extinction of life; consequently the second must likewise be a cessation of conscious existence.

We are sometimes told, "if the punishment of the wicked is simply extinction of being, it is not a very heavy penalty, and consequently, we take away the motive to repentance." Let us look this objection in the face. Is *death* a punishment? Is there any higher penalty? Please settle this point before we advance. Is it possible for a rational, common-sense man, to claim for one moment that *death* is not a punishment? This point being settled, we would ask another question. As death is a punishment, would not *eternal death be eternal punishment*? Let sober reason answer, and all will say, yes. But the objection may arise in some mind, "How can the wicked be punished when they are *dead*?" Why, for the reason that *death* is the punishment. "But how can they suffer when they are dead?" "The wages of sin is *death*," not suffering; and the punishment does not *begin* till they are *dead*. Suppose the punishment was whipping, when would it begin?—"When they begin to whip." How long would it continue? "As long as the whipping continued." If the penalty was imprisonment, when would it begin? "As soon as they were put in prison." How long

would it continue? "As long as they are kept in prison." We now come to the point. If the punishment is *death*, when does it commence? "Why, when they are *dead*." Certainly. How long will it continue? "As long as they remain dead." Well, as the punishment is eternal, it follows as a matter of course, that they will never come to life after they die the "second death;" but, as expressed by the prophet, "*they shall be as though they had not been.*"

Another objector says, — "If *death* is the only punishment, it is not very great." In reply, we remark, if eternal death is a small punishment, then it follows as a sequence, that eternal life is a small reward. Does any one wish to take such a position? If eternal life is the reward of the righteous, as the Bible most plainly teaches, then those who die "the second death" lose all the righteous have gained. The whole matter is resolved into a simple problem of loss and gain. The good gain eternal life through Christ, and the wicked lose it. "God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not *perish*, but have *everlasting life*." John 3: 16. As eternal life is the highest possible reward; the opposite, or *eternal death*, is the *highest possible punishment*. The whole universe is worth nothing to a man, when his *life* is taken away.

We can see how the Lord can *destroy* men in the exercise of love and mercy; but we can see neither love, mercy, nor justice, in keeping men, women, and children alive eternally, for the sake of tormenting them. If a domestic animal — a dog for instance — should be terribly



mangled, and was howling and yelling in agony, your kind friends and neighbors would say, "Why don't you kill him, and put him out of misery?" Finally, in mercy to the dog, you take his life and end his sufferings. Upon the same principle, we believe God destroys the wicked. At the judgment, thieves, pirates, robbers, murderers, and other wicked classes, stand condemned, in the most miserable and awful situation, and the question arises, what can be done with them? Mercy says, *destroy* them; love speaks, put them out of existence; justice says, they are worthy of *death*; and God in his goodness says, "*They shall be as though they had not been.*" This looks *right*. He does the wicked no injustice, when he puts them back to dust in their original condition. All they enjoyed in this life was clear gain: and as they have refused to comply with the terms upon which they can have eternal life, and have formed habits in this world which would make them miserable in the world to come, the Lord in mercy refuses to perpetuate their existence in misery, and is consequently obliged to take away their life, and let them die "the second death," from which there is no resurrection; hence they experience eternal death, or "eternal punishment."

If *man* moves away to heaven, or "hell torments" at death, — why have a judgment day afterwards, when he is to be called out of happiness or misery, to see if he was put in his proper place? According to the *Bible*, man is not rewarded nor punished till after the seventh angel sounds. See Rev. 11: 15, 18.

"And the seventh angel sounded; and there were

great voices in heaven, saying, the kingdoms of *this world* are become the kingdoms of our Lord, and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever . . . . And the nations were angry, and thy wrath is come, and the time of the *dead*, that they should be *judged*, and that thou shouldest give *reward* unto thy servants the prophets, and to the saints, and them that fear thy name, small and great and shouldest *destroy* them which destroy (margin, *corrupt*) the earth."

Does he sound every time there is a death? If so, the kingdoms of this world become our Lord's as often as one dies.

If *man* is immortal, why is it that we cannot find the doctrine taught somewhere in the Bible, in its sixty-six books, and about fifty authors? If every thing in the Bible which relates to the immortality of *man* was stricken from its pages, no change would be made in any passage except in Gen. 3: 4, where Satan says to our first parents, "ye shall *not* surely die."

If we can prove that *one* man is mortal the whole argument is gained, for we are all alike in this attribute. The Lord says to Joshua, "*Moses* my servant is *dead*." Joshua 1 2. Is it possible the Lord would say Moses was dead when he was alive in heaven, or any other place? Why did Moses die? Because of his trespass at the waters of Meribah-Kadesh. Then on account of his *trespass* he went to glory before Joshua! Does this look consistent? Those who claim man does not go to his *full* reward at death, hold that the good are much better off in the intermediate state than when here on the earth; hence Moses was quite a gainer on account of his trespass. If Joshua had only trespassed at the same



time, he might have gone to Paradise with Moses, but for his obedience he had to stay longer and pass through many trials escaped by Moses. It is hard for us to believe such theology.

Again, in John 11: 14, we read, "Then said Jesus unto them plainly, *Lazarus is dead*" We believe our Saviour told the truth, and if he did, Lazarus was not alive when our Lord made the declaration.

We have now the testimony of our Creator and his Son that man is *mortal*, and is not this sufficient?

We have yet to learn from the Bible, physiology, philosophy, facts, or common sense, that a dead man, or any part of him is *conscious* between death and the resurrection.

#### FACTS.

We will now present a few facts which may be useful to the Bible student.

*Ruach*, the Hebrew word rendered *spirit*, in Eccl. 12: 7, where the spirit is said to return to God, is found in all four hundred times in the Old Testament, and is rendered in seventeen different ways, but is not *once* translated soul. *Pneuma*, the corresponding word in the Greek, found three hundred and eighty-five times in the New Testament, is rendered in eight different ways, but is not *once* rendered soul. These taken together make seven hundred and eighty-five. If soul and spirit are synonymous, why are not these words sometimes rendered soul? If this is the conscious part, and never dies, why do we not find some passage teaching that the spirit is immortal?

*Nephesh*, the word rendered *soul* in the Old Testament (with two exceptions), is found seven hundred and fifty-two times, but it is never said to be an immortal soul. This word is translated in forty-four different ways, and is twenty-six times applied to beasts. The two exceptions are in Job 30 : 15 (*n'deevah*) and Isa. 57 : 16, (*n'shamah*). These two added make seven hundred and fifty-four.

*Psukee*, the Greek word rendered soul in the New Testament, and corresponding with *nephesh* in the Old Testament, is found one hundred and five times, and is rendered in eight different ways. It is rendered soul fifty-eight times, and *life* \* and lives forty times. These, added to those in the Old Testament, make eight hundred and fifty-nine; but in all these we are not once told that the soul is immortal, but frequently read about souls being killed. If we add together the words rendered soul and spirit, they amount to sixteen hundred and forty-four. Why is the whole Bible silent on the immortality of the soul and spirit, if such a doctrine be true?

In the Old Testament, the words which are rendered "die," "death," and "dead" occur one thousand nine hundred and thirty-nine times; and the corresponding words are found in the New Testament six hundred and forty-three times, making in all two thousand five hundred and eighty-two; and yet in all these we do not find a hint that the man is alive between death and the resurrection.

\**Nephesh* and *psukee* would be very properly translated *life*, in many passages, where they are now rendered soul. Gen. 35 : 18, Matt. 10 : 28, and Mk. 8 : 36-7 are instances.



## CONCLUSION.

*What is man?* Candid reader, what shall we do with these facts? Shall we still declare, in opposition to all these, that the soul is immortal? that man never dies? We cannot do it, without joining with Satan, and contradicting the Lord. Let objectors examine every passage where the words soul, spirit, die, death, and dead occur, and then we think they will cease their opposition, and acknowledge that the *Bible* teaches us that *the whole man dies, and remains unconscious till the resurrection "at the last day."*

We have now endeavored to prove from a harmony of Scripture testimony, that the *whole man*, — the accountable being, was made "of the dust of the ground;" that the truth of the Bible is addressed to him as a unit, and not as a double entity; that the "breath of life" breathed into his nostrils is not the man, or the conscious, accountable part, but that which sets the human machinery in motion; that this "breath of life" is the same in every living creature, and when possessed of it, they are called living souls; that death invariably takes place when it is taken from man or any other animal; that the whole man remains unconscious between death and the resurrection, and will never live again unless the dead are raised; that when a man is in *sheol* or *hades*, he is simply in the grave, where there is "no knowledge;" that wicked men are to "be punished with everlasting destruction," and not with eternal torment; that immortality is to be obtained "by patient continuance in well doing," and to be put on at the resurrection, when the Lord comes.

Paul says, "I kept back *nothing* that was profitable unto you; . . . I have not shunned to declare unto you *all* the counsel of God." Paul has not said one word about an immortal soul, or spirit, or about eternal torment; consequently, it is not "profitable," nor in harmony with "the counsel of God."

MILES GRANT,

BOSTON.



# THE RICH MAN AND LAZARUS.

---

“Prove all things, hold fast that which is good.”—PAUL.

When we present the many plain passages which declare positively that the **WHOLE MAN** dies, the question is often asked, “*How can Luke 16: 19-31 be harmonized with the idea that the dead are unconscious between death and the resurrection?*”

In answering this question, it will be necessary, in order to get the connection, that we go back to the commencement of the 15th chapter. In the second verse we read,—“The Pharisees and Scribes murmured, saying, this man receiveth sinners, and eateth with them.” From this point, we think, the Savior goes on to vindicate himself against the above charge, by showing the Pharisees that they act on the same principle in temporal things, that he does in spiritual, and closes with the parable of the rich man to illustrate the then future history of the Jews, resulting from rejecting the Messiah. He first vindicates his course by the parable of the lost sheep, and says,—“What man of you, having an hundred sheep, if he lose one of them, doth not leave the ninety and nine in the wilderness, and go after that which is lost, until he find it?” The Pharisees could not deny that this would be their course of action. Jesus then pleads guilty to their charge, and says,—“I say unto you, that *likewise* joy shall be in Heaven over one sinner that repenteth, more than over ninety and nine just persons which need no repentance”

With the eighth verse, he commences another and similar illustration in the parable of the ten pieces of silver. He inquires, what woman, who had ten pieces of silver and lost one, would not light a candle and seek diligently till she found it, and then rejoice? He then makes the same application again, saying, "there is joy in the presence of the angels of God over one sinner that repenteth." If they would rejoice because they had found a lost *sheep* or piece of *money*, should they not still more when a *sinner* is restored to the favor of God?

The Savior next introduces the parable of the prodigal son in the eleventh verse, to illustrate the conduct of the Jews towards the Gentiles with whom he had been eating and conversing. In this pointed illustration, we believe the *elder brother* represents the *Jews*, and the *younger* the *Gentiles*. All were counted as Gentiles from creation to Abraham, who was considered the father of the Jews. Said they, "we have Abraham to our father." Like the prodigal son, the Gentiles had squandered all their blessings, and wandered far from the Lord in their idolatrous worship; in short, they had spent every thing; but when they beheld Jesus and his wonderful works, they began to think of returning to the true worship of God, and because Jesus sympathizes with them in their lost condition, they charge him with being a friend of publicans and sinners; and like the elder brother in the parable, they are offended, and entirely refuse to co-operate with Jesus and the angels in restoring the lost sinner, and rejoicing over him. The Jews, like the elder brother in the parable, for many years had been the favored people of the Lord, and should have been delighted when they learned that Gentiles were to share the blessings of the gospel with them, but they were so sectarian in their feelings, that they could take no satisfaction in the prosperity of any church but their own, and felt even angry when they saw the Gentiles received into "Abraham's bosom," or in other words, brought into the Abrahamic covenant.



Thus far the Lord has been addressing *Pharisees*, who complained of him for receiving sinners and eating with them; he next speaks to his *disciples*, (chap. 16: 1-13) instructing them how to use "the mammon of unrighteousness," and teaching them that they "cannot serve God and mammon." We learn from chap. 16: 14, that the *Pharisees* listened to this conversation of Jesus with his disciples, and being covetous, "they derided him." The Savior then continues his conversation with the *Pharisees*, to the close of the chapter, introducing the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. In verse 16, he declares that, "The law and the prophets were *until John*." Since then, there has been a change which the Pharisees refuse to acknowledge. He illustrates this point in verse 18, by the law regulating the marriage relations, and says,—“Whosoever putteth away his wife and marrieth another, committeth adultery; and whosoever marrieth her that is put away from her husband, committeth adultery.” If any do not see the application of this, let them turn to Rom. 7: 1-4. Says Paul, “Know ye not, brethren, (for I speak to them that know the law,) how that the law hath dominion over a man as long as he liveth? For the woman which hath an husband is bound by the law to her husband, so long as he liveth: but if the husband be dead, she is loosed from the law of her husband. So then if, while her husband liveth, she be married to another man, she shall be called an adulteress; but if her husband be dead, she is free from that law; so that she is no adulteress, though she be married to another man.” In the next verse he makes the application, which shows plainly why the Savior introduced the same subject when talking with the Pharisees. Hear him.—“Wherefore, my brethren, ye also are become *dead to the law* by the body of Christ, that ye should be *married to another*, even to Him who is raised from the dead, that ye should bring forth fruit unto God.” We found the Lord declaring that the *law* was until

John, that is, unto John's ministry; and when he commenced preaching, the time had come to put away the law, be baptised, and be married to Christ, "for Christ is the *end of the law* for righteousness to every one that believeth." Rom. 10: 4. This the Jews refused to do, and were married again to the *law* which had been divorced by the Savior, consequently they were adulterers. We now come to the parable of the rich man and Lazarus. We have endeavored to show—

1. That the Pharisees condemned Christ because he received sinners and eat with them.

2. That he pleads guilty to the charge, and vindicates his course by showing the Pharisees that, when they lose a sheep or piece of money, they at once make search for the lost, and rejoice when it is found.

3. That, in the parable of the prodigal son, he brings out the fact that they did not rejoice when he came to save lost sinners, who are of more value than many sheep or pieces of silver, thereby proving that they, and not himself, were the ones to be censured.

4. That the time had come to put away the *law*, and be married to *Christ*, which they refused to do, consequently, they are condemned as adulterers.

We will now examine "the parable of the rich man," given as we believe to illustrate the history of the Jews and Gentiles, from that time to the end of this dispensation.

Some claim that Luke 16; 19-31, is *not a parable*, but a *history* of what actually took place. Let us look at this position a few moments. Ver. 22. "And it came to pass, that the beggar *died*, and was *carried* by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the rich man also *died* and was *buried*." All, who claim that this is a *history* of what actually took place, must admit,—

*First*,—that *Lazarus died*, not his *body*, but *Lazarus himself*; and he that *died was carried*, not something else, for the record reads, "the *beggar died*, and *was carried*." If I say a man died in the street and



was carried into the house, would any one suppose that I meant they carried *his soul* in and left his *body* in the street? Then why say in this case that the angels carried his *soul*, and left his *body*, when it is expressly declared that the *beggar* that *died was carried*? If this is *history*, then whatever it takes to constitute *Lazarus*, *died* and *was carried* to Abraham's bosom.

*Second.* "The rich man *also died*, and *was buried*." In this case, the one that *died*, is the one that was *buried*. If this is also a *historic* account, it follows that the rich man came to life after he was buried, and a flame burned in the grave, for the word rendered *hell*, in ver. 23, is *hades*, which is *never* used to denote the future punishment of the wicked, but simply the *grave*, where all remain between death and the resurrection. The word *hades* rendered *hell* in the passage, corresponds with *sheol* in the old testament, which invariably refers to the grave, or the state of the dead when used in its literal sense. The same word occurs in 1 Cor. 15 : 55. "O death, where is thy sting; O *grave*, (*hades*) where is thy victory?" If *hades* represents the place where the wicked are *tormented*, and *some* come out and shout "*victory*," why will not *all*?

The question arises,—what is the condition of one in *hades* or *sheol*? Let the wise man answer.—"There is *no* work, nor device, nor *knowledge*, nor *wisdom*, in the grave, (*sheol*) whither *thou* goest." Such then was the state of the rich man while in *hades*, but this cannot be harmonized with the text if it is a *historic* account instead of a parable; because, while he is in hell, (*hades*, the grave,) he is represented as having both device and knowledge, which could not have been true, unless he was buried alive; but the latter supposition cannot be accepted for a moment, for the text declares that "*the rich man died*." Whatever constituted the rich man, *died*, otherwise, it is not a true history, for there was nothing buried in *hades*, (the grave) only what *died*; hence, if there was any-

thing about him that did not die, it was not the rich man, and was not put in *hades* at all, but went to some other place. If this is a historic account, there was nothing tormented only what *died* and was *buried*, and no one can suffer in the grave, unless buried *alive*, but as the rich man was *dead*, we are driven to the conclusion, that this account is not a *history* of what actually took place, but a parable.

But for argument's sake, we will take another view of the subject, and suppose that the *man* did not die—only his *body* or the house in which he lived, was buried in hell, (*hades* or the grave) while his *soul* went into torment. Now let us read this scripture in harmony with this position. Begin at ver. 22. "And it came to pass that the [*body* of the] beggar died, and [*his soul*] was carried by the angels into Abraham's bosom; the [*body* of the] rich man also died, and [*his soul*] was buried. And in hell, (*hades*, the grave,) he lifted up his eyes [*of his soul*] being in torments, and seeth [*the soul* of] Abraham afar off, and [*the soul* of] Lazarus in his bosom. And he cried and said, father Abraham, [*let thy soul*] have mercy on me, and send [*the soul* of] Lazarus, that he may dip the tip of his [*soul's*] finger in [*literal*] water, and cool my tongue" [*of my soul*]. The foregoing paraphrase is in harmony with the theory, that *only* the *body* died; but we think all can see the absurdity of such an exposition. Even if we should adopt this paraphrase as truth, it completely overthrows the idea that man exists in a *disembodied* state between death and the resurrection; for he is represented as having *eyes*, *fingers* and *tongue*, and these organs do not exist and act independently of the rest of man's physical organism; consequently, we have the *whole material man* existing and acting, between death and the resurrection; then what will he do with this body when he is raised from the dead at the coming of the Lord? "For the Lord *himself* shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archan-



gel, and with the trump of God; and the *dead* in Christ shall rise first; then we, which are *alive* and remain, shall be caught up together with them in the clouds, to meet the Lord in the air." 1 Thess. 4; 16-17. This last scripture teaches plainly that something now *dead* is to be raised to life when Christ comes. Job asks the interesting question,—“if a *man* die, shall *he* live *again*?” Hark! and hear the Savior's answer.—“Marvel not at this; for the hour is coming, in the which all that are in the *graves* shall hear his voice, and shall come forth, they that have done *good*, unto the resurrection of life; and they that have done evil, unto the resurrection of damnation.” John 5: 28-29.

We can see no *possible* way of harmonizing the scripture, if we take the position that the account of the rich man and Lazarus, is a *literal history* of what actually took place. At this time, the Savior had been speaking to the Pharisees in *parables*, and we read that, “without a parable spake he not unto them.” The Rich Man and Lazarus is a continuation of his discourse with them. See Luke 16: 14-15. Let it be remembered that there is not one word about *soul* or *spirit* in the whole account.

We have endeavored to show that this account could not be a history of what actually took place. But we are sometimes met with the objection, that, “all parables are founded on facts,” and consequently such a case happened at some time. We think those who make such a remark should examine the Bible and laws of language more closely before they repeat the statement. We would ask if the following parable, from Ezk. 17; 2-8, is founded on *fact*?—

“Son of man, put forth a riddle, and speak a *parable* unto the house of Israel; and say, thus saith the Lord God, a great eagle with great wings, long-winged, full of feathers, which had divers colors, came unto Lebanon, and took the highest branch of the cedar; he cropped off the top of his young twigs, and carried it into a land of traffic, he set it in a city of merchants. He took also of the seed of the land, and planted it in a fruitful

field; he placed it by great waters, and set it as a willow tree; and it grew and became a spreading vine of low stature, whose branches turned towards him, and the roots thereof were under him; so it became a vine and brought forth branches, and shot forth sprigs. There was also another great eagle with great wings and many feathers; and, behold, this vine did bend her branches towards him, that he might water it by the furrows of his plantation."

It must be a very strange *eagle* that takes the branches off from the cedar and sets them out, causing them to grow "in a city of merchants;" and then takes the seed of the land to plant, raising vines which spread their branches *towards* himself! and more than this, the *roots* grow towards another great eagle! We think all can see that *this* parable is not founded in *fact*.

Again, we think no one will claim that the parable of Jotham is founded in *fact*, recorded in Judges 9; 8-15. It reads—

"The *trees* went forth on a time to anoint a king over them, and they said unto the olive tree, reign thou over us. But the olive tree said unto them, should I leave my fatness, wherewith by me they honor God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? And the *trees* said to the fig-tree, come thou and reign over us. But the fig-tree said unto them, should I forsake my sweetness, and my good fruit, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said the trees unto the vine, come thou and reign over us. And the vine said unto them, should I leave my wine, which cheereth God and man, and go to be promoted over the trees? Then said all the trees unto the bramble, come thou and reign over us. And the bramble said unto the trees, if in truth ye anoint me king over you, then come and put your trust in my shadow; and if not, let fire come out of the bramble, and devour the cedars of Lebanon."

Do *trees* talk, assemble together, and appoint kings? Without further remarks on this point, we think all must be convinced that parables are not *always* "founded on fact."

We now return to the Scripture under consideration—"the rich man and Lazarus." We think it has been clearly shown that it is *not* a *historic* account of what actually took place, but a *parable*, given in connection with others to illustrate the character and his-



tory of the *Jews* as connected with the *Gentiles*. The Savior showed the Jews, who accused him of receiving sinners and eating with them, that, when they lost a *sheep* or piece of *money*, they endeavored most faithfully to restore the lost, and that they *rejoiced* when success attended their effort; but when Jesus came to save *lost sinners*, who are of more value than all the sheep or money, the Jews were offended, as illustrated by the parable of the Prodigal Son. The elder brother should have felt great joy when the lost one was found and restored to his father's family; but instead of this feeling, he is offended, and refuses to co-operate in the rejoicing.

After instructing his disciples, by the parable of the unjust steward, how to use the mammon of unrighteousness; Jesus tries once more to convince the Pharisees that the time had come to put away the *law*, by saying, in verses 16-18, that "the law and the prophets were until *John*," and, consequently, if they went back to the law, they would be guilty of adultery, or of marrying the divorced; but as the Jews still refused to hear him, he proceeded to foretell their history, as well as that of the *Gentiles*, in the parable of the "rich man and Lazarus."

The question now arises, who is *represented* by the "rich man and Lazarus?" According to the laws of parables and symbols, the rich man does not *represent* a rich man, neither does the beggar symbolize a poor man, for then it would cease to be a parable, and be changed to a simple history of the two individuals; but we think the absurdity of the historic view has been clearly shown. In the parable of the tares and wheat, the tares represent the wicked, and not literal tares; and the wheat symbolizes the righteous, and not literal wheat; and the same principle is applicable to all parables; and when applied to the rich man and Lazarus, it is at once evident, that, as the rich man and the beggar do not symbolize *rich and poor men*, literally; their death does not represent literal

death; in short, that which is symbolized, is different from the symbol; hence it follows also, that the grave, the gulf, the flame, and Abraham's bosom, do not represent *themselves*, for if they do, they are no part of the *parable*; therefore, when we come at its *true* meaning, crumbs, dogs, sores, &c., will not represent crumbs, dogs and sores, but something bearing an *analogy* to the symbol; in other words, the poor man represents that which is in a degraded condition, and afterwards exalted, while the rich man symbolizes that which is highly favored and exalted, and subsequently meets with a complete reverse.

Having shown, as we believe, that the common application of this parable to the intermediate state of the dead, cannot be true, because it makes the Bible contradict itself, and also does violence to the plain principles of justice, by sending men to their reward and punishment, before the day of judgment, it remains for the advocates of the common theory to give us an exposition that shall be in harmony with sound principles of exegesis and the Bible itself. As Jesus has given us no explanation of this parable, we do not feel under obligation to offer any ourselves, but, in order that the whole conversation of the Savior at this time may be made plain, it seems proper that a brief exposition should be presented.

As we have before remarked, we understand that the Savior gives a condensed history of the Jews and Gentiles by means of this parable,—*the rich man representing the Jews, and Lazarus the Gentiles*. This is not a *new* theory got up by those who believe in the sleep of the dead, or by Universalists who believe all men will be saved; but was believed and taught by such men as Lightfoot, Whitby, Wakefield, Theophylact, James Bate, Dr. Gill, and many others. Says LIGHTFOOT:—

“ Whosoever believes this not to be a parable, but a true story, let him believe also those little friars, whose trade it is to show the monuments at Jerusalem to pilgrims, and point exactly to the



place where the rich glutton stood. Most accurate keepers of antiquity indeed! who, after so many hundreds of years, such overthrows of Jerusalem, such devastations and changes, can rake out of the rubbish the place of so private a house, and such a one too, that *never had any being, but merely in parable*. And that it was a parable, not only the consent of all expositors may assure us, but the thing itself speaks it. The main scope and design of it seems this,—to *hint the destruction of the unbelieving Jews.*”

WHITBY says:

“This is *only a parable*, and not a real history?”

Says WAKEFIELD, an able translator:

“To them who regard the narration as a *reality*, it must stand as an unanswerable argument for the *purgatory of the papists.*”

THEOPHYLACT, an ancient christian writer, says:

“By the rich man is signified the *Jewish people.*”

Although he applied it also to the concerns of the next life, he says:

“Lazarus was the *Gentile* people, poor in divine grace and wisdom, and lying before the gates; for it was not permitted to the Gentiles to enter the house itself, because they were considered a pollution.”

DR. GILL makes a two-fold application of it; and says the death of the “rich man” may be understood to represent “the *political and ecclesiastical* death of the *Jewish people.*”

JAMES BATE, M. A., Rector of Deptford, says:

“We will suppose, then, the *rich man* who fared so sumptuously, to be the *Jew*, so amply enriched with the heavenly treasure of divine revelation. The *poor beggar* who lay at his gate, in so miserable a plight, was the poor *Gentile*, now reduced to the last degree of want, in regard to religious knowledge.... The beggar *dies*, and is carried by the angels into Abraham’s bosom; that is, he is engrafted into the church of God. And the *rich man* also *dies and is buried*. He dies what we call a *political death*.—His dispensation ceases. He is rejected from being any longer the peculiar Son of God. The people whom he parabolically represents are miserably destroyed by the Romans, and the wretched remains of them, driven into exile over the face of the earth, were vagabonds, with a kind of mark set upon them, like Cain, their prototype, for a like crime; and which mark may perhaps be their adherence to the law.

There can be no doubt that the account of the "rich man and Lazarus" is a parable. A manuscript of the seventh century commences it as follows:—"And he spake also another parable." One of the tenth century reads:—"The Lord spake this parable."

We have introduced these testimonies to show that the exposition we give was not got up to favor the sleep of the dead, or those who believe in universal salvation, but to give a *common sense* view of the parable in harmony with the rest of the Scriptures. We are fully persuaded that the *rich man* represents the *one house* of Israel, composed of the *two tribes*, Judah and Benjamin; and the *five brethren*, the *other house*, or the *ten tribes*, who were carried captive by Shalmanezzer seven hundred and twenty-one years before Christ, and have not returned to this day. They are denominated the *ten lost tribes* of Israel. (These *two houses* of Israel are frequently mentioned after their separation, which took place in the days of Rehoboam and Jeroboam; hence the prophet Isaiah is taught to say, when speaking of the coming of Christ,—“he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling, and for a rock of offence, to *both the HOUSES of Israel*.” The sequel of the Jewish history has proved the truth of this prophecy. As the rich man was taken to represent the *two tribes*, Judah and Benjamin, who occupied Jerusalem when the Savior was on earth; it is rational to suppose that the *five brethren* should represent the other *ten tribes* who were dwelling among strangers in foreign lands.

The rich man, like the elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son, occupied a favored position, but was unwilling to welcome the poor man to his hospitalities. The elder brother had lacked no good thing, and would not have felt the least privation if he had kindly welcomed his poor brother home, and rejoiced with his father;—so the *rich man* was abundantly supplied with earth's choicest blessings, and would have suffered no loss, if he had granted the poor man's



request, who only asked for the *crumbs*; or like the younger brother, to be a *servant*; but the elder brother—(the Jews,) and the rich man representing the same, would confer no favor upon the poor man—(the Gentiles;) but in both cases he is finally exalted, and the rich man humbled. Jesus had come to preach the gospel to the *poor*, but the rich man, (the Jews) instead of co-operating with him as he should have done, would not receive Christ because he befriended the poor;—like the elder brother, he would not go in to rejoice over lost *sinners* found, but would rejoice when he found a lost *sheep*, thus showing that he cared more about saving sheep than sinners,—more about *money* than eternal salvation.

Whatever view be taken of this parable, it cannot be used to define or represent the punishment of the wicked *after* the judgment, because the whole scene is this side of that event.

For an explanation of the *torment* of “the rich man,” the Jews, please read Deut. 28; 15-68. In the first fifteen verses of this chapter, the Lord makes great promises to “the rich man,” on condition, as he says, “that thou hearken unto the commandments of the Lord thy God, which I command thee this day, to observe and do them.” His future history shows that he did not obey, but departed from the Lord and conformed to the manners of the surrounding nations. The Lord assured him if he did not obey, he should be overtaken by the following curses:—

“But it shall come to pass, if thou wilt not hearken unto the voice of the Lord thy God, to observe to do all his commandments and his statutes which I command thee this day; that all these curses shall come upon thee: Cursed shalt thou be in the city, and cursed shalt thou be in the field. Cursed shall be thy basket and thy store. Cursed shall be the fruit of thy body, and the fruit of thy land, the increase of thy kine, and the flocks of thy sheep. Cursed shalt thou be when thou comest in, and cursed shalt thou be when thou goest out. The Lord shall send upon thee cursing, vexation, and rebuke, in all that thou settest thine hand unto for to do, until thou be destroyed, and until thou perish quickly; because of the wickedness of thy doings, whereby thou hast for-

taken me. The Lord shall make the pestilence cleave unto thee, until he have consumed thee from off the land, whither thou goest to possess it. The Lord shall smite thee with a consumption, and with a fever, and with an inflammation, and with an extreme burning, and with the sword, and with blasting, and with mildew; and they shall pursue thee until thou perish."

"The Lord shall cause thee to be smitten before thine enemies; thou shalt go out one way against them, and flee seven ways before them; and shalt be removed into all the kingdoms of the earth. And thy carcass shall be meat unto all fowls of the air, and unto the beasts of the earth, and no man shall fray them away. The Lord will smite thee with the botch of Egypt, and with the emerods, and with the scab, and with the itch, whereof thou canst not be healed. The Lord shall smite thee with madness, and blindness, and astonishment of heart: and thou shalt grope at noonday, as the blind gropeth in darkness, and thou shalt not prosper in thy ways: and thou shalt be only oppressed and spoiled evermore, and no man shall save thee. .... Thy sons and thy daughters shall be given to another people, and thine eyes shall look, and fail with longing for them all the day long: and there shall be no might in thine hand. The fruit of thy land, and all thy labors, shall a nation which thou knowest not eat up; and thou shalt be oppressed and crushed alway: so that thou shalt be mad for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see. .... The stranger that is within thee shall get up above thee very high; and thou shalt come down very low. .... Because thou servedst not, the Lord thy God with joyfulness, and with gladness of heart, for the abundance of all things; therefore shalt thou serve thine enemies, which the Lord shall send against thee, in hunger, and in thirst, and in nakedness, and in want of all things; and he shall put a yoke of iron upon thy neck, until he have destroyed thee. .... And thou shalt eat the fruit of thine own body, the flesh of thy sons and thy daughters, which the Lord thy God hath given thee, in the siege, and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee: so that the man that is tender among you, and very delicate, his eye shall be evil toward his brother, and toward the wife of his bosom, and toward the remnant of his children which he shall leave: so that he will not give to any of them of the flesh of his children whom he shall eat: because he hath nothing left him in the siege, and in the straitness, wherewith thine enemies shall distress thee in all thy gates. The tender and delicate woman among you, which would not adventure to set the sole of her foot upon the ground for delicateness and tenderness, her eye shall be evil toward the husband of her bosom, and toward her son, and toward her daughter, and toward her young one that cometh out from between her feet, and toward her children which she shall bear: for she shall eat them for want of all things secretly in the siege and straitness, wherewith thine enemy shall distress thee in thy gates. .... If thou wilt



not observe to do all the words of this law that are written in this book, that thou mayest fear this glorious and fearful name, THE LORD THY GOD; then the Lord will make thy plagues wonderful, and the plagues of thy seed, even great plagues, and of long continuance, and sore sicknesses, and of long continuance. Moreover, he will bring upon thee all the diseases of Egypt, which thou wast afraid of; and they shall cleave unto thee. Also every sickness, and every plague, which is not written in the book of this law, them will the Lord bring upon thee, until thou be destroyed. And ye shall be left few in number, whereas ye were as the stars of heaven for multitude; because thou wouldst not obey the voice of the Lord thy God.... And the Lord shall scatter thee among all people, from the one end of the earth even unto the other; and there thou shalt serve other gods, which neither thou nor thy fathers have known, even wood and stone. And among these nations shalt thou find no ease, neither shall the sole of thy foot have rest: but the Lord shall give thee there a trembling heart, and failing of eyes, and sorrow of mind: and thy life shall hang in doubt before thee; and thou shalt fear day and night, and shalt have none assurance of thy life: in the morning thou shalt say, would God it were even! and at even thou shalt say, would God it were morning! for the fear of thine heart wherewith thou shalt fear, and for the sight of thine eyes which thou shalt see."

This prophecy was delivered while Moses was leading the children of Israel to the promised land, before they had possessed or built any city. How faithfully the Lord has kept his word. After the Jews rejected Christ, he said to them, "Jerusalem shall be *trod-den down* of the Gentiles, until the times of the Gentiles be fulfilled."—Luke 21: 24. They were to suffer "vexation," "madness," "astonishment" "diseases," "plague," "a trembling heart," and "sorrow of mind."

Here we have a complete description of the *torment* of the rich man, which has been suffered by the Jewish nation for the last eighteen hundred years.

We now come to inquire, who is represented by *Lazarus*? As already intimated, we answer—the *Gentiles*. What is meant by the *death* of the beggar, and his being carried to Abraham's bosom? As this is a *parable*, the death cannot be *literal*, nor the entrance into the bosom of Abraham. It will be noticed that nothing is said about the *burial* of Lazarus.

We understand his death to signify a *moral* and *political* change in the condition of the Gentiles, in consequence of the Savior's work accomplished in breaking down the wall between the Jews and Gentiles, and receiving the latter into the new *covenant*; for when the Gentiles embraced Christ, they became "*Abraham's seed* and heirs according to the promise." The Gentiles *died* to their idolatrous worship, became the followers of Christ, and have been highly exalted, both *morally* and *politically*; while the *Jews* have died both *morally* and *politically*, and still lie in a *buried* condition, "*trodden down*," or tormented by the Gentiles,—the poor beggar who once sat begging at their gate, but was not even allowed to share the least favor in common with them. The Jews would "*have no dealings with the Samaritans*" because they permitted Gentiles to have some privileges in their city; but they have since been tormented in their *political hades*, or grave, for nearly eighteen hundred years; scattered among all nations, denied the privilege of holding offices of trust; in short, they have been placed in the same condition in which they tried to keep the Gentiles; "but now he (the beggar, or Gentiles) is comforted, and thou, (the rich man, or Jews) art tormented." How perfectly the Savior illustrated the then future history of the Jews and Gentiles by this parable, which completed his answer to the charge preferred against him by the Pharisees at the commencement of the 15th Chap.,—"this man receiveth sinners and eateth with them." The Jews, like the elder brother in the parable of the prodigal son, had received "good things," and Lazarus, or the Gentiles, "evil things," but for hundreds of years their relative condition has been *reversed*. We think this truth was the important idea that the Savior wished to communicate by means of the parable.

As is often remarked, "we do not believe that parables should be made to go on all fours;" i. e., we do not think that Jesus intended we should look for a correspondence



between *every particular point* mentioned in the parable, and that which it represents. For instance, in the parable of the *lost sheep*, mentioned in chap. fifteen, we have, 1, one hundred sheep. 2, One strays and is lost. 3, Ninety-nine are left in the wilderness, while search is made for the lost one. 4, When found, he puts it on his shoulders and goes home. 5, He calls on his friends and neighbors to rejoice with him. Who can suppose that the Savior intended we should look for an act in the plan of salvation corresponding with each of these five particulars? The simple idea is, that when a lost thing is found, we feel joy. This is expressed in ver. 7, when he says,—“likewise joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth.” So in the parable of the rich man, we do not expect every little item is to have a corresponding event in that which is represented.

*The gulf.* If the gulf is to have a correspondence in the history of the Jews and Gentiles, it must represent something that prevents a Jew, while he continues in his Jewish faith and customs, under the old covenant, from joining the Gentile christians; and at the same time will not allow a christian, as such, to unite with the Jews. From this consideration, we think the *gulf* may represent the *new covenant*, “established upon better promises,” of which Jesus was the mediator. The Jews rejected this covenant confirmed by Christ, and were married again to the *law*, from which Christ and the apostle Paul most plainly declares they were divorced; consequently, they became adulterers in refusing to come into the new covenant, and be married to Christ, as we endeavored to show in the first part of this work. The Gentile christian cannot join the Jewish church and continue a christian, because he would be throwing away Christ, and connecting himself with the *law*, which is divorced; hence the *new covenant* stands as a *gulf* between Jews and Gentiles.

*The five brethren.* As has been already intimated, we understand that they represent the ten lost tribes of Israel, who were carried captive by Shalmanezar seven hundred and twenty-one years before Christ. They were not joined

5 Brethren X

Moses\*

with the Jews (the other two tribes) in condemning and crucifying the Savior; and therefore they are represented as being in a safer and better condition than the rich man.

We think Paul refers to them when he says,—“Brethren, my heart’s desire and prayer to God for *Israel* is, that they might be saved.” When they went into captivity, they took the Scriptures with them, hence it is said, “they have Moses and the prophets; let them hear them.”

When the request is presented that one may be sent “from the *dead*,” the reply is made, “if they hear not Moses and the prophets, neither will they be persuaded, though one rose from the *DEAD*.” Observe, he does not say, though a spirit or soul come from “the spirit land,” to teach them; but if one *rose from the dead*.” Subsequently to this, the Savior rose from the grave, but they still continue in their unbelief, thus proving his saying true.

In conclusion, we remark, we can see no reason for believing this parable was given to show the state of the dead between death and the resurrection; because, in the first place, such a view seems to be foreign to the subject then under consideration; and in the second place, it would be contradictory to plain and positive texts of scripture, which describe the condition of man in the intermediate state.



## The Thief on the Cross.

---

This is considered, by many, as the main pillar to sustain the doctrine of the immortality of the soul. We find no difficulty in harmonizing this passage with our views of the state of the dead. In considering this subject, there are several points that demand attention.

1. *The question* of the thief in ver. 42,—“Lord, remember me when thou *comest* into thy kingdom.” Observe, the thief does not carry any idea that he thought of going *with* the Savior to a kingdom at death, but wishes to be remembered when the Lord *comes* into his kingdom.—Where will the Savior’s kingdom be located? After the seventh angel sounded, John heard “great voices in heaven, saying, the kingdoms of *this* world are become the kingdoms of our Lord and of his Christ; and he shall reign forever and ever.” Rev. 11; 15. This event is yet *future*, therefore the thief cannot be in the kingdom yet, for the reason, that our Savior has not yet come to take possession of it. “Blessed are the meek for they *shall* inherit the earth.” Matt. 5: 5. When the meek shall inherit the earth, then Christ will have come into his kingdom, and the thief may *then* have his petition answered. The new earth, Christ’s kingdom, and Paradise are evidently used in the Bible to represent the same thing; and we have yet to learn that the saints of the Lord will have a reward anywhere else than on *this* earth, after the curse is removed; consequently, the thief is not *now* with Christ in his kingdom.

2. *The Savior’s answer*.—“And Jesus said unto him, verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise.” Ver. 43.

(1.) We will notice first, the *place* where they are to meet—in paradise. Where is paradise? Some tell us it is a concealed place in the earth, where souls go at death; that the good in that condition are happier than when here on the earth; that the wicked are more miserable, but the souls of both classes must wait for the resurrection of their bodies before they can enter upon their eternal state. This may do for heathen philosophy, but we do not see how the Bible student can adopt such an idea and adhere to the Scriptures! We all believe that Adam was in paradise before he disobeyed his Creator, but we are as well agreed that no such beautiful garden is in the land of Eden at the present time; still we find a *promise* to the faithful christian, that he shall yet partake of the fruits of paradise; or in other words be *restored* to the glorious state of the first happy pair, before sin entered. Jesus says in his last Revelation,—“To him that overcometh will I give to eat of the tree of life which is in the midst of the *paradise* of God.” This scripture plainly shows that the “tree of life” will again bear fruit in paradise, which we cannot think is some deep cavern, or subterranean place, but the new earth which the meek shall inherit. We think this point is made plain in the Revelation of St. John. In the 21st chap., our Savior gives us an account of a “new heaven and a new earth,” and of the holy city, the New Jerusalem, that is to be upon it; and in chap. 22; 2, he says,—“in the midst of the street of it, and on either side of the river, was there the tree of life, which bear twelve manner of fruits, and yielded her fruit every month.”

We have now found that the tree of life is in Paradise, and at the same time, in the new earth, which is the kingdom of Christ, where the thief wished to be received when our Savior comes; and hence it follows again, that the thief is not *now* in paradise, because it is not yet prepared.

(2.) *The punctuation* of this verse demands attention. It should be borne in mind, that our system of punctuation was introduced by “Manutius, a learned printer, who lived at Venice, in the 15th and 16th centuries;” and that the



Scriptures were written originally without any pauses, hence any one has a right to punctuate the Bible as the sense may demand. We will instance some examples where the meaning is changed by the use of the comma. "But this man, after he had offered one sacrifice for sins forever, sat down on the right hand of God." Heb. 10: 12. In many Bibles the comma is put after *sins*, instead of *forever*, which would make the passage declare that Christ had "forever sat down," and therefore will never rise up again, to return to this world to set up his kingdom; but such a view would be a palpable contradiction of the Bible; but if the comma is placed after *forever*, then the verse teaches that he is never to offer himself as a sacrifice again, but that this one is sufficient, which is the true meaning.

Again, in Matt. 19: 28 is a passage where the power of the comma is shown. "And Jesus said unto them, verily I say unto you, that ye which have followed me, in the regeneration when the Son of Man shall sit in the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel." We have frequently seen the comma placed after *regeneration*, instead of *me*; and when this is done, the passage teaches that Christ was *regenerated*, (which many understand to mean converted,) and that if we will follow him in *regeneration*, then we may all sit on twelve thrones, and judge the twelve tribes of Israel; but if we put the comma after *me*, then the verse teaches that the twelve apostles, who had forsaken all and followed Christ, shall, in the regeneration, or when they rise from the dead, sit with him in the throne of his glory, which gives the true idea.

Now we will return to our text,—Luke 23: 43. If we put the comma after *to-day*, then *to-day* qualifies the verb *say*, which makes this passage harmonize with the whole Bible; but if we leave it where it is, then it qualifies *shall be*, and would go to show that the Savior and the thief both went to Paradise that day; but we have already seen that Paradise is in the new earth and yet to come; consequently, the present position of the comma gives a wrong idea to the

verse. The Greek adverb *semeron*, here rendered "*to-day*," may be translated by the word *now*, and we think the sense of the original would be much better expressed, if it read, now I say unto thee, thou shalt be with me in paradise,—not between death and the resurrection, but when Christ comes into his kingdom. If our readers will observe the common use of language, they will notice that all classes of persons frequently use *to-day*, *to-night*, *this day*, and *this night*, in the same sense that *to-day* is used in the text, provided it qualifies *say*. I am informed that one of the best translators places the comma *after* "*to-day*." Some may object, by saying that *to-day* is superfluous in our arrangement—no more so than in many cases in the Bible. The Lord instructs Moses to say to the children of Israel, "I command thee *this day*."—"I denounce unto you *this day*, that ye shall surely perish." Deut. 30:11, 18. He does not mean that they shall perish that day, but declares the denunciation that day; which fact was perfectly apparent without stating it, but it is a common mode of expression. Again, the Lord says in Deut. 15:15,—"*I command thee this thing to-day*." Here, *to-day* is used in the same sense as in Luke 23:43,—"*verily I say unto thee to-day*, thou shalt be with me in paradise." If the phrase, *to-day*, is superfluous in Lk. 23:43, if made to qualify *say*, it is equally so in Deut. 15:15, and in the following extracts from the speeches of Daniel Webster and Mr. Choate. Says Mr. Webster, on the 7th of March, 1850,—"*I speak to-day for the preservation of the Union*." All knew he was speaking *that day*, without his declaring the fact. Mr. Choate at another time said,—"*To-day*, fellow-citizens, we also speak for the Union." These distinguished orators use *to-day* in the same sense as it is used in Luke 23:43, when the comma is placed after the phrase.

We remember hearing an intelligent minister, say:—"I expect to-night, to get into the kingdom." If we put the comma after *expect*, instead of to-night, and emphasize *night*, then we make him say he will get into the kingdom before morning. He made the remark in a conference meeting, and was only speaking of his present expectation.



We have observed that similar expressions are very common.

This verse is one of the strongest to support the doctrine of the immortality of the soul, and is more frequently brought by our opponents to prove their position, than any other; but we see that their whole argument rests upon the *very doubtful* position of the comma. Besides, there is not a word about the *soul* or *spirit*, in the whole account. If the pause be placed after *to-day*, then this verse is in harmony with the whole Bible. Shall we make this *doubtful comma* the corner stone of our foundation, and set aside plain and *positive* scripture?

(3.) Again, if it could be proved that the thief went to heaven or paradise the day of the crucifixion, it was forty-three days before the Savior ascended. The Savior says, "thou shalt be with *me* in paradise." Three days subsequent to this, after the Savior had risen from the dead, he says to Mary, "touch *me* not, (the same *me*) for *I* (the same one) am *not yet* ascended to my father.." He remained on earth forty days longer, and then ascended to Heaven.

From this brief examination, we conclude that the prayer of the thief is not yet answered, and cannot be, until Christ comes into his kingdom, when paradise will be restored; consequently this passage is in harmony with the doctrine of the sleep of the dead.

## Souls under the Altar

---

Sometimes, Rev. 6: 9 is presented as evidence that man has, or is, an immortal soul, that "never dies." Let us look at this candidly for a few moments:—

"And when he had opened the fifth seal, I saw under the altar the *souls* of them that were slain for the word of God, and for the testimony, which they held." The two verses following read, "And they cried with a loud voice, saying, how long O Lord, holy and true, dost thou not judge and avenge our blood on them that dwell on the earth? And white robes were given unto every one of them; and it was said unto them, that they should rest yet for a little season, until their fellow servants also and their brethren that should be *killed* as they were, should be fulfilled."

There are four points that should be noticed in the account.—

1. *What* was seen? 2. *Where* seen? 3. Their *cry*. 4. Their *condition*.

1. *What was seen?* We are told by some that "it was their disembodied immortal spirits"; but the word *psuche*, here translated *soul*, is not rendered *spirit* once in the Bible. Another says, "it was their disembodied immortal *souls*." We have not yet been able to find any proof that such exist as *conscious* entities, nor any evidence that such were ever seen, or can be seen, unless it is found in this passage. The souls say, "our *blood*," but they do not speak as though their *bodies* had been *killed*, and they, the souls, had escaped unharmed. We have many examples where *nephesh*, the Hebrew word corresponding with *psuche*, is rendered *person*; and in Prof. Whiting's translation of the New Testament, *psuche* is rendered *person* in this passage. Prof. Whiting has the reputation of being one of the best Greek and Hebrew scholars in America, and is now employed in the new translation by the American Bible Union. If this be rendered *person*, it will be in harmony with the whole Bible; whereas, if we use the word *soul*, in the popular sense, we make the Scriptures contradict themselves.

2. *Where were they seen?* "Under the altar." Where was the altar? Dr. Clark, when speaking on this passage, says:—"The altar is upon the *earth*, not in Heaven." It could not have been either in Heaven or hell (*hades*), for they were slain neither in the one nor the other. It seems that John saw in vision the great slaughter field, where the martyrs were to be slain upon



earth, and calls it "the altar," on which millions were butchered for their testimony in favor of Jesus. Let it be remembered, these souls (persons) are seen about the altar, which was upon the earth.

3. *Their cry.* If they were alive, it appears they were in a very uneasy and suffering condition; in which case, it must have been their cry as they were led by the thousand to the altar for slaughter; but there is another sense in which they cry. As Dr. Clark says, "Their blood, like that of Abel, cried for vengeance." Says the Lord to Cain, "The voice of thy brother's blood CRIETH unto me from the ground." It is said of Christ, that his blood.....speaketh better things than that of Abel." Thus does the blood of the martyrs cry. It should be observed that the account is clothed more or less in symbolical language, and should not be so interpreted as to contradict plain and literal Scripture, which would be the case, if this passage was made to teach that the souls of men are conscious when the men themselves are dead.

4. *Their condition.* They are not only "under the altar," which is upon earth, but they are "killed." It is that very part that John saw; that part which cried, that was "killed." This same class is mentioned again in Rev. 20: 4. "And I saw the souls (persons, Whiting's trans.) of them that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus.....and they lived and reigned with Christ a thousand years. But the rest of the DEAD lived not again until the thousand years were finished." This is so plain it seems to need no comment. Some of these souls, or persons, had been beheaded, which of course killed them. Then they could not reign with Christ till made alive; hence we read they lived, and "this is the first resurrection." "But the rest of the dead lived not again until the thousand years were finished." Why say they "lived not," if they were all alive in hades, in torment?

We think it plain that John saw in vision the martyred saints during the Papal persecutions, as they lay weltering in their blood, which, like Abel's and Christ's was a witness against their cruel tormentors. They remain in the embrace of death till the vision passes on to Rev. 20: 4, where he sees them live again and commence their reign with Christ, and are pronounced "blessed," because they have "part in the first resurrection."

## Death of the Soul.—Matt. 10: 28.

---

There is one more text that needs a passing notice—Matt. 10: 28. The passage reads—“Fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill the soul; but rather fear him which is able to *destroy both soul and body in hell.*” The same caution is given in Luke 12: 4, in the following language:—“And I say unto you, my friends, be not afraid of them that kill the body, and after that have no more that they can do. But I will forewarn you whom ye shall fear; fear him, which after he has *killed* hath power to cast into hell; yea, I say unto you, fear him.”

The word rendered *hell* in this passage is *gehenna*. This word originally represented “the valley of Hinnom,” a place near Jerusalem, where sacrifices were offered by the Jews. It became a filthy place, and fires were kept burning to *destroy* or consume the filth there deposited. Worms assisted in devouring the carcases left there for consumption. Nothing was thrown among this mass of corruption which they wished to preserve; and when the Savior would illustrate the final, future punishment of the wicked, he refers to this *gehenna* or valley of Hinnom. Nothing could show more clearly that the wicked were not to be preserved alive eternally; for whatever was cast *alive* into the fire of *gehenna*, soon had its life destroyed. And to make the case as strong as possible, and their *entire destruction* beyond all doubt, he says, the fire shall not be quenched. An unquenchable fire always *consumes* the burning object. If the fire could be quenched, a part of the burning body might be saved from the “devouring fire;” but if *unquenchable*, it must be burnt up. All beings cast into an unquenchable fire, must lose their *lives* and have their bodies destroyed.

In Matt. 10: 28, we learn that we should “fear him which is able to DESTROY *both soul and body in hell.*” Does any one suppose that the bodies of wicked men would be *preserved* by being cast into a fire that could not be extinguished? Certainly not. But the *soul* is destroyed in this case as truly as the *body*. It reads, “destroy *both.*” This can not mean destroy the one, and preserve the other from the effects of the fire. Fire either *purifies* or *consumes*. It is employed in purifying gold and silver, and for consuming thorns, briars, stubble and tares. The wicked are compared with the last four objects mentioned, but never with anything that would not be burned up if cast into fire.

The word rendered *soul* in this text, is rendered *life* and *lives* forty times out of one hundred and five that occur in the New Testament. We know of no reason why it may not be translated *life* in this passage as well as in any other. In one transla-



tion, the "Emphatic Diaglott," we notice it is rendered *life*. This makes the passage harmonize with the whole Bible. Is it safe to put a construction upon this text which will be in opposition to all the rest of the Scriptures? This is the only passage we can find which *seems* to teach that there is anything about man that cannot be killed by his fellow; but the question arises, what does the word *psuche* in Matt. 10: 28 represent? We think it does not mean *this* present *soul* or life, for the reason that the destruction threatened is not in this life, but in the world to come. Man can and does take *this* life, according to many records in the Bible. Is there any other life? "This is the promise that he hath promised us, even eternal life."—1 John 2: 25. Can *man* take that, or kill it? Nay, verily. "Be not afraid of them that kill the body, [or take this life,] and *after* that have no more that they can do." It is certain, then, that *man* cannot take from us our future life, now "hid with Christ in God."

If we should attempt to put the popular construction on Matt. 10: 28, making soul mean the real man, it will be seen from examination, that it overthrows the position assumed, and makes the Bible contradict itself. Let us suppose that *soul* in this passage represents the real man,—the man David if you please; and in order to make the point plain, we will put the word David in the place of soul, premising that David and soul are synonymous. Then it will read, "fear not them which kill the body, but are not able to kill" David; "but rather fear him which is able to destroy both" David and his "body in hell." This makes a full destruction of the whole of David. No part escapes from the destruction.

But we return to the first clause of the verse. Admitting that soul and David are identical, permit Peter to say a word about this matter. "Men and brethren let me freely speak unto you of the patriarch *David*, that *he* is both *dead* and *buried*—*David* is not ascended into the Heavens."—Acts 2: 29, 34. "For *David*, after he had served his own generation by the will of God, fell on *sleep* and was laid unto his fathers and saw corruption."—Acts 13: 36. If *soul* represents the *real man* David, then it is plain, according to the Bible, that he is both dead and buried, and is not ascended into the Heavens. We think it plain that the word *soul* in Matt. 10: 28 does not represent the *man*, but the *future life*, over which man has no power. He may cut us off from this present existence, but cannot from the life to come, which is *promised* through Christ, as a gift to be received when He "who is our life shall appear."

We find the words rendered die, death, dead, &c., occur twenty-five hundred and eighty-two times in the Bible, not one of which intimates that the being is alive between death and the resurrection, unless it be the one under consideration. Is it fair to interpret this *one* so as to make it contradict twenty-five hundred and eighty-one others? We leave the reader to judge.

## “In the Day.”—Gen. 2: 17.

---

It has been claimed that the penalty threatened Adam was a *moral* death, because he did not die a *literal* death “in the day” he sinned. *Spiritual* death, or sin, could not have been his penalty, unless the crime and penalty are alike, which is too unreasonable to believe. Were it so, it would be like requesting a thief to continue stealing as a punishment for his theft. It is more probable that the *day* is spiritual; i. e., a day for a thousand years, than that the penalty should be like the crime. Besides, if the penalty were a spiritual death, then that which dies must be spiritually mortal; and the spiritual death of a spiritual thing must as truly kill, or cause it to cease, as the literal death of a literal thing; so that in either case, there must be a cessation of *conscious* existence.

The margin reads;—“In dying thou shalt die.” Dr. Clarke remarks on this passage: “From that moment thou shalt become mortal and shalt continue in a dying state till thou die. This we find literally accomplished.” The Greek of Symmachus reads: “Thou shalt be mortal.” Likewise the Syriac, which is approved by Jerome and Grotius. The Arabic reads:—“Thou shalt deserve to die.” The Targum of Jonathan,—“Thou shalt be subject to death.” Vatabulus says:—Thou shalt be subject to death, both of body and soul.”

Had Adam died the day he sinned, our race would have ended there, as he had no children at that time. It is certain, however, that his Creator did not intend he should die the day he disobeyed, because he said to him;—“In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread, *till* thou return unto the ground.”

The grand difficulty in this passage centers upon the little word *in*. The Hebrew preposition *be*, translated “in,” is rendered in thirteen different ways, one of which is *after*. When prepositions are translated, we choose from the varied renderings the one which is thought to convey the true idea of the writer. In this case our translators believed in the immortality of the soul, and concluded that the punishment threatened was a *moral* death, experienced the day Adam sinned, and hence rendered the preposition *be*, by the word “in,” instead of *after*. If they had used the latter word, it would have harmonized with all the facts, and made the matter plain. As it now is, with the claim that the



death, or penalty, on Adam was a *moral* one, the Universalist has the argument, when he quotes 1 Cor. 15: 22—"As in Adam all die, (a moral death,) even so in Christ shall all be made (morally) alive," and hence be saved. Their reasoning is correct, if the premises are sound. But we find it impossible to harmonize the Scriptures when we take the position that the death is a *moral*, instead of a *literal* and *real* one. Death comes upon us because Adam, by his sin, became *mortal*, and hence all his children must be mortal, till the Life-giver comes to give eternal life to all that have obeyed him, and thereby shown that they wish to be his subjects in the coming kingdom. Gesenius says we should render the preposition *be* by the word *after*, "where the mind rests more upon the *end* of a period, and spoken therefore of time already past." This is precisely the case in Gen. 2: 17. The passage shows that the mind of the Lord was resting upon the *end* or *results* that would follow Adam's disobedience. Death must *certainly* follow; but he is to live awhile, and earn his bread by "the sweat" of his face, "till" he should "return unto the ground." This is now accomplished and Adam sleeps in death because he would not obey God.

In Num. 28: 26, we have this preposition rendered both *in* and *after* in the same verse.—"Also *in* the day of the first fruits, when ye bring a new meat offering unto the Lord, *AFTER* your weeks be out, ye shall have an holy convocation." When the preposition *be* occurs in the original, we can use either of the thirteen words employed to translate it, which we think best conveys the idea of the writer. In the example now under consideration, we are fully satisfied it should read, "*After* the day thou eatest thereof, thou shalt *surely* die;" hence we read, "All the days that Adam lived were nine hundred and thirty years; and *he died*." There the death penalty is executed: and, if there were no resurrection promised through Christ, it would be "eternal punishment;" but as man is to rise again, the first death is only a temporary punishment. When raised from the dead, and found guilty, not for Adam's transgression, but for their *own* sins, if they suffer the "*second death*" it is eternal punishment, because they are never raised to life again, but are buried forever beneath the waves of oblivion, and '*shall be as though they had not been*.'

## Absurdities of Modern Theology.

---

In a work published by L. Lee, on the soul, he says, on p. 33, the soul is “*without figure, form, color, impenetrability, extension, divisibility, gravitation, attraction, or repulsion.*” We can hardly conceive how *nothing* could be better defined. He says:—“The mind in its present state is dependent upon the bodily organs for primary ideas.” How that which has no “*extension*” can depend upon matter for ideas, remains to be shown. “The soul” he says, “is an *immaterial spirit.*” And then says; “*If the soul is a simple, spiritual essence, immaterial, uncompounded, and indivisible, it must be immortal in itself.*” As well say *nothing* is immortal! For that which is immaterial, uncompounded and indivisible cannot possibly be a living being, either praising the Lord, or wailing in agony. As soon as a sound is made, it is proof positive that something *material* is in motion. He says:—“Frost will kill the body, but no one will contend that an immaterial spirit can be frozen to death.” Of course not. “It will not be pretended,” he says, “that an *immaterial, intangible, indivisible* soul can be cut to pieces with saws, knives or axes.” Certainly not. He goes on to say; “An immaterial, uncompounded spirit cannot be affected by material fire, any more than it can by frost; it could dwell alike in the sun or in the polar regions.” In summing up his arguments, he says:—“By all the conclusiveness, then, by which we have sustained the immateriality of the soul, does its immortality follow.” If *nothing* has a conscious existence, then we might conceive how it could be immortal. He further says: “The argument drawn



from the immateriality of the soul, not only proves that it is immortal in itself, living forever, if left to the operations of the laws of its own nature, but it proves that *God cannot destroy it.* "If God himself has made the soul immaterial, he cannot destroy it by bringing material agents to act upon it. God cannot destroy that which is uncompound, or divide that which is indivisible." We think it needs no labored argument to prove that *nothing* is indestructible.

Mr. Lee introduces an argument from Drew, a very able writer on the subject. When arguing for the immateriality of the soul, and its nature, he says:—

"As an immaterial substance has no surface, it is a contradiction to suppose that matter can ever be brought in contact with it. To suppose such a contact *possible*, is to suppose a surface in an immaterial being, which at the same time is excluded by its natural immateriality. Whatever has an *exterior* must have an *interior*, and what has both, must be extended. An immaterial substance has *no surface*, and that which has no surface can never be brought into contact with that which has; it therefore follows that the soul must be inaccessible to all violence from matter, and that it cannot perish through its instrumentality."

Let the reader strain his imagination to get some idea of such a being as described by these writers, and when most successful, he will find he has only been trying to conceive *nothing* to be *something*. But we are told this "immortal soul" "is the *real man*." We are also told in a recent work, entitled "Spirit Life," by Rev. T. Spicer, D. D., that "there is no conceivable connection between *matter* and *thought*." We would like to inquire of this highly esteemed and venerable minister of Christ, what causes derangement in case of brain fever or from any other cause, if there is *no* "connection between matter and thought?" And why do old men, when their physical systems are nearly worn out, manifest such imbecility of *mind*? Why does a blow on the head stop the thinking, and render the individual *insensible*? Why does intoxicating liquor produce delirium tremens? Why has not the idiot with his low, sloping

forehead, the same strength of mind as he who has a well developed brain, if there is no "connection between *matter and thought?*"

Again, Dr. Spicer says:—"The soul exists wholly independent of the body which it inhabits, although there are certain actions it cannot perform without using the body to which it belongs. It can neither see, hear, nor speak, without using the body."

Then it follows that, when this soul gets out of the body, it is *deaf* and *dumb* and *blind*. Hence, if it goes to Heaven, it can hear no one's voice, sing no praises, and see no one there. Who would desire to be in such a gloomy state? We dread to be *deaf*, much more to be *deaf* and *dumb*; but to be *deaf* and *dumb* and *BLIND* is so near being dead, that life must be but a burden, almost intolerable to be borne, by one who has once enjoyed the full possession of his faculties.

We leave the reader to his own reflections; praying that, if we meet not in this vale of sighs and tears, we may unite in joy and praise, where sorrow, pain, sickness and death, are felt and feared no more.



